DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 097 239 SO 007 797

TITLE	Social Sciences and the Sixth Form--An Approach Through Integration. Schools Council Pamphlet No. 11.
INSTITUTION	Schools Council, London (England).
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	80p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Copies available free, while supplies last, on application to the Central Despatch Section, Schools Council, 160 Great Portland Street, London W1N 6LL
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC Not Available from EDRS. PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Affective Objectives; *Comparative Education; Conference Reports; *Course Organization; *Curriculum Development; Higher Education; Inductive Methods; Inquiry Training; *Integrated Curriculum; Intellectual Disciplines; Interdisciplinary Approach; Secondary Education; *Social Sciences; Teaching Methods; Testing
IDENTIFIERS	Great Britain

ABSTRACT

The task of a conference on social science education in the sixth form was to explore the problems and possibilities of establishing an integrated social science course. Conference papers and discussion deal with the nature of the social science disciplines and the meaning of their integration; the principles--knowledge, skills, problems, concepts, and methods--on which integration would be based; and the problems of implementation. An introductory paper presents "The Case for Integration." The nature and logic of integration are discussed in case studies from a secondary school, university, and college for further education. Implications of curriculum change for the education of intended teachers and in the instance of an integrated curricula at one college are discussed. Recommendations from discussion groups are summarized and put into the perspective of three considerations: (1) inquiry at the senior level is a new method of instruction, one usually reserved for primary school; (2) little is known about how to teach the elusive and explosive content of the social sciences; and (3) affective learning on such topics requires careful handling. (JH)

SC pamphlet 11

SOCIAL SCIENCES AND THE SIXTH FORM - AN APPROACH THROUGH INTEGRATION

a report of a conference organized by
the Schools Council Social Sciences Committee

SCHOOLS COUNCIL
160 Great Portland Street
London W1N 6LL

1973

ALSO IN THIS SERIES OF PAMPHLETS

7 Integrated Studies in the First Years of Secondary School: Some Practical Problems Involved (1970)

8 Co-operation Between the Youth Service and Schools (1971)

9 Race Relations and the Curriculum: a Short Analysis and Summary of the Work Initiated by the Schools Council (1972)

10 Short-stay Residential Experience: Residential Work by Secondary School Pupils (1972)

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

The Sixth-form Social Sciences Conference organized by the Social Sciences Committee of the Schools Council was held from 28 June to 1 July 1971 at the Centre for Applied Research in Education at the University of East Anglia. The Conference was to examine the problems and possibilities of establishing integrated social sciences courses for sixth forms. The Committee was particularly concerned with this issue because of the present trend of proliferation of separate social science subjects at GCE advanced level, and its possible consequences for sixth-form curricula. As the conference chairman suggested, it was hoped to generate a sufficient body of ideas to warrant the publication of a report and also to give guidance to the Council about the sort of development project which might be launched as a follow-up. The task of the conference was set out in a paper on 'aims and issues', and was intended to be exploratory in nature; perhaps more definite answers might be forthcoming from a future development project.

The conference began with the assumption that it was (a) desirable to include social sciences in the sixth-form curriculum, and (b) necessary to produce a viable integrated curriculum if this were to be achieved in practice.

Aims and issues

The aims and issues put before the conference, were in three main parts:

1. The nature of the subjects and the meaning of integration

In what sense can one integrate the social sciences? To what extent should an integrated approach rest on the common ground between disciplines; or alternatively, to what extent must it highlight their differences?

Which of the following subjects should be included if the whole is to be coherent: politics, economics, history, geography, social anthropology, archaeology, psychology, social physiology, sociology?

2. The basis for integration

To what extent would it be possible to start from the questions sixth-formers actually ask about human behaviour and human society?

What are to be the principles of integration: knowledge, skills, problems, concepts, or methods? More specifically, should an integrated social science curriculum be conceived as an introduction to a number of related but distinct modes of inquiry, rather than to bodies of knowledge?

5. The problems of implementation

What inductive base is possible in teaching the social sciences? What is the equivalent of laboratory work in the physical sciences?

What is the role of (a) problem solving, (b) case studies, (c) games and simulation exercises, (d) practical activities, (e) books, (f) topics used for learning activities and source materials?

Who is going to teach the course? What are the implications of this for materials and methods, and how can the need for teacher retraining be met?

The report which follows was written by Mrs Charmian Cannon of the University of London Institute of Education who was a member of the conference steering committee.

I. INTRODUCTION

It was planned that the case for integration would be set out on the first evening, and the first full day would be devoted to theoretical issues concerning the nature and logic of integration, while the second day of the conference would be occupied with problems of implementation. Participants and speakers had been invited to represent these different aspects of the topic under discussion. Thus there were present academic social scientists from universities and education departments; those concerned with teacher education; heads and teachers from colleges of further education and schools; and some concerned with the conduct of examinations and with the business of curriculum planning.

Interaction between these people of diverse interests and qualifications (see Appendix D) was inevitably intensive and, as is usual on such occasions, the formal plan outlined above bears little resemblance to the situation as it actually developed.

My account of the atmosphere and key discussion themes of the conference aims only to be a personal interpretation. Since attending it I have heard at least three widely differing accounts of what happened. I shall present a fourth one and although I shall do my best to represent fairly the main centres of disagreement and consensus, I shall probably fail to do justice to them all. I hope everyone who attended the conference will put their own gloss upon what I say. Even the most rigorously controlled evidence in the social sciences is always subject to personal interpretation. In this case the interpretation is based on my own involvement in the themes discussed, and my lack of expectation of my present role. It is also coloured by the fact that I am a sociologist concerned with the preparation of graduates to teach the social sciences in schools, as well as with the teaching of sociology.

I think it would be accepted, however, that the conference was not characterized by consensus. There were certain groupings of viewpoint which gradually crystallized during the two days but these views were unfortunately not fully aired in public until the end of the second day. There were also certain recurring themes which I hope to make clear in my account of the proceedings; some of the topics listed under 'aims and issues' were relatively neglected, other themes, unforeseen, became central talking points. Similarly it became clear that the rigorous division of the discussion into 'nature and logic', and 'practical implications' was not feasible. Speakers did not speak according to their brief, but according to their personal predilections. Attempts at curriculum change rarely proceed from a logical academic basis through to a consideration of the practical problems; these aspects are constantly interwoven, as they were in the accounts of the speakers. Also they cannot be considered apart from school social structure and pupil-teacher relationships, and this meant that discussion ranged widely beyond its brief.

One divisive factor was, of course, the variety of participants in the conference. There were 'in-groups' of various kinds who already knew each other's backgrounds and who shared a common view. Academic social scientists

tend to speak as if everyone is familiar with their language. That this should cause confusion was to be expected, but less expected was a point put to me, that different kinds of social scientists are so narrowly reared in their own disciplines that they do not always understand each other - a graphic illustration of one of the problems besetting any attempt at integrated curricula! Teachers and heads of schools hoping for new ideas to incorporate in their sixth-form timetables were inevitably disappointed at the way in which the academics wrangled happily about what the social sciences are and how they differ from one another; they may well have lost confidence in whether the social scientists at present know enough of what they are about to offer them anything fruitful and teachable. But I think they were cheered by some of the examples of actual courses reported even though none of these originated from school sixth forms!

Another divisive factor lay in the fact that not all the conference members accepted the brief put to them by the Schools Council. Paul Fordham, on the staff of the Council, said hopefully that the conference would start from the assumption that it was desirable to teach social sciences in the sixth form, and that it was necessary to produce 'a viable integrated curriculum' to achieve this. Some teachers probably needed convincing of the first: many more participants were unconvinced of the second. Some thought that the continued development of single subject courses was more desirable, or more feasible. Many were afraid of the denigration of what had been achieved already in this field and its substitution by a monolithic 'integrated' social sciences curriculum. Perhaps their fear arose from an image of the Schools Council as the power that shapes curriculum practice in schools. But I think it would be fair to say that neither the participants nor the Schools Council were considering anything but some alternatives to existing practice.

Perhaps the reason why the major disagreements did not really emerge until the final session was chiefly the short time available and the segregation of members into small groups for almost all the discussion time. These groups were so small that their discussions could sometimes be pushed in one direction by one or two knowledgeable and committed members. There was little chance to test these directions against others until the final plenary session.

My summary of the situation is that the conference had too much to discuss in too short a time. There was so much to talk about, so many points of view to do justice to, that at the end members were still sorting out the main contestants and beginning to recognize the issues. Nevertheless when I came to review it I thought it had done part of what it set out to do: it did pinpoint the issues which preoccupy people; it did reach consensus in some rather negative ways about what should not be done. It did bring into contact people who otherwise rarely meet and get them to share their ideas. It seems to me to have generated enough ideas and enthusiasm to be worth pursuing further, which is why after initial doubt I think it worth while to write this report.

II. THE CASE FOR INTEGRATION

Philip Abrams, Professor of Sociology from the University of Durham, opened the conference by presenting the case for integrating the social sciences at school level. Professor Abrams was an obvious choice for this task as he has had a long-standing interest in such an alternative to the present A-level sociology syllabus, and is probably best known to members of the conference through his article in New Society.* He had also worked out an interesting scheme for an integrated course which had been discussed by a small group of interested people on a previous occasion. Professor Abrams focused his talks on some of the central problems raised by the statement of 'aims and issues'.

> The first set of questions is: In what sense can one integrate the social sciences? To what extent will an integrated approach rest on common ground between the disciplines? Or alternatively to what extent must it highlight their differences? My reaction to these questions is to feel that perhaps the problem is being put the wrong way round, or at least too defensively; that the question that should be asked is not, how can one integrate the social sciences but how on earth can one legitimately not integrate them, how can one justify the academic carving-up of a unified concern - the study of man in society - into a series of professedly distinct disciplines? Of course one can understand why as a matter of intellectual history and administrative convenience in universities the fragmentation of the social sciences should have occurred. But is there any good reason for the product of a long process of intellectual opportunism to be treated today as though it were a law of nature? I should like to think that we could treat the question of whether the schools should follow the pattern set by the universities as a genuinely open one. Because there are some quite important reasons why in this field the schools should in fact not follow the universities.

Professor Abrams went on to deal with two objections to the idea of integration. First, there was the difficulty of finding suitable teachers. This he thought could be overcome in the present situation of changing degree structures and increasing use of team teaching in schools. The second objection was that the social science disciplines each have a scientific integrity which should be preserved. He argued, however, that the differences between disciplines were chiefly those of technical standards, and there was a strong case for demonstrating the wholeness of social processes, as well as the distinctness of disciplines.

---

* P. Abrams, 'The trouble with school sociology', New Scientist, 31 October 1968.

> If it is thought desirable to keep alive a sense of the wholeness of the social processes and situations of which the particular social science disciplines typically study particular bits, then the schools would seem to have an important part to play in such a division of labour precisely in insisting that learning, or unemployment, or hooliganism, or old age, do have a wholeness which is also a proper object of study. The case for integrating the social sciences in the schools is not at all then, as I see it, a case against the separation of the social sciences in universities. Or not necessarily that.

He then went on to justify in some detail the promotion of integrated social sciences at school level:

> The case rests on two main arguments which do have implications for what goes on in universities, however. There does need to be some meaningful relationship between school social science and social science elsewhere. My suggestion is simply that this relationship does not have to be that of a mirror-image. The idea of a division of labour is equally viable. And it can be justified in terms of both the subject-matter and the philosophy of the social sciences. These are indeed the two main grounds in terms of which an integrated approach would have to be justified. An attempt to integrate our teaching seems to me to follow naturally from any careful consideration of either the basic methodological problems of the social sciences or the nature of everyday life. Like it or not, any actual course of instruction, integrated or otherwise, has to exist somewhere in the middle ground between very abstract questions of methodology and very palpable experiences of society. And it needs to make sense from both points of view.

Professor Abrams then discussed the philosophical argument for integration:

> A recent collection of papers such as Sociological Theory and Philosophical Analysis edited by Professors Emmet and MacIntyre* makes it pretty clear that uncertainty still prevails both about the extent to which the social sciences are really sciences and about the degree of intellectual autonomy which any particular social science can properly claim on either substantive or methodological grounds in relation to any or all of the other social sciences. In this situation a fairly pragmatic approach, governed fairly directly by short-run considerations of pedagogic expediency seems not unreasonable. Were it possible to assert with any degree of confidence, either that particular social sciences had demonstrated a clear autonomy and sufficiency in respect of their own subject-matter and methods, or that the social sciences collectively were manifestly sciences in the sense of being able to achieve theoretically grounded explanations of [illegible] respective fields of subject-matter within their own methodologies terms of reference then the case for teaching the social sciences as such, separately, in schools would be very strong. But it is not possible to assert either of these things and there can therefore be little philosophical objection to the advocacy of a teaching procedure which is deliberately eclectic and grounded in substantive problems rather than in disciplines.

---

* D. Emmett and A. MacIntyre (Macmillan, 1970).

He continued to elaborate his arguments by distinguishing between the different social science disciplines:

> What we have is not so much a set of social sciences as an array of social disciplines. These disciplines fall into two groups which can be called the open-ended and the restricted disciplines. The former would include all those around and between which it is effectively impossible to draw either methodological or substantive boundaries: history, anthropology and above all sociology. These disciplines suffer from a necessary eclecticism of problems, theories and methods, which denies them any convincing autonomy as sciences. They constantly plunder the intellectual resources of other fields of inquiry and in turn are themselves constantly plundered, giving rise to new restricted disciplines. The restricted disciplines by contrast, such as economics, demography, and archaeology are ones which, having confined themselves for good or bad reasons to the study of limited categories of data, have developed by cultivating specific and esoteric techniques peculiarly appropriate for the analysis of the subject-matter defined in this way. Whether one regards psychology as one of the restricted sciences or follows Runciman* in treating it as a potential master science in terms of which the findings of other social sciences are theoretically sustained is not too important in this context...
>
> Pushing the case a bit, then, one could say that at present the social sciences are either not sciences or not social. And that their claims to be treated educationally as autonomous sciences are not therefore automatically impressive...

Professor Abrams argued that for these reasons the scientific status of the social disciplines should not be overstressed at an early stage; an additional reason against doing so was that:

> it creates all sorts of problems of identity for the would-be social scientist which are not only very difficult to solve but possibly irrelevant as well. Some time ago Bernard Crick wrote a valuable article for New Society† in which he urged that the image of the scientist should play a smaller part in the self-conceptions of the social scientist and that that of the lawyer should be emphasized instead. Happily this view is gaining ground. It is increasingly accepted, that we are not going to be able to produce many complete explanations or solutions to problems, many logically closed demonstrations of causal relationships between dependent and independent variables, in these fields of study. All of Charles Booth's labours could not produce a scientific demonstration of the necessity of old-age pensions. Not only is our position today no stronger than Booth's, it is misleading for us to believe that it is so. What can be done, however, is to marshal very strong arguments for particular cases from the close analysis of available evidence and by means of agreed rules of procedure - and to require that alternative cases be advanced with the same kind of cogency and rigour. And as Crick points out this is actually a more dignified and valuable enterprise than that of vainly pursuing the chimera of a self-evident social science.

---

* W. G. Runciman, Sociology in its Place and other Essays (CUP, 1970).

†'What is truth in social science', New Society, 4 June 1964.

Professor Abrams then went on to consider the basis for integration - 'To what extent should it be possible to start from the questions sixth-formers actually ask?'

> The subject-matter [of the social sciences] does not present itself to us in a disciplinary form but rather in the form of more or less directly perceived problems. It would be nice to be able to say that I know that this is how the social world appears to students in sixth forms. Unfortunately we don't know nearly as much as we should about the questions sixth-formers actually ask and when I say that the natural breakdown of the content of the social sciences is not by disciplines but by problems I am really speaking for myself. If I were a sixth-former I suspect that I would see the world in terms of a series of multi-faceted issues: employment, career, identity, intimacy, power, goodness and badness, all sorts of possible processes of becoming. No one discipline will deal with the whole of any of these issues and from what I have already said I hope it is clear that I don't think that there is any strong a priori case for saying that in the face of conflicting definitions of reality between the disciplines on the one hand and prospective students on the other the disciplines should be given precedence. Unemployment is for many in the final years of school a personal trouble; it is also an economic problem; but the economic problem is also a political problem, related to decisions made within an agenda of political options about the desirability of a slack labour market; again, it is a psychological problem, particularly in a society where morale and self-esteem are so closely tied to occupational roles; it is a geographical and historical problem rooted to some extent in the distribution of natural resources and the phasing of industrialization; and in many senses it is a social problem, embedded in the values and power structure of the society and entailing complicated institutional arrangements for its management or solution. In all its aspects a phenomenon such as unemployment can be studied objectively, comparatively, scientifically. Such studies will enormously clarify the social meaning of unemployment and create an effective capacity to argue about it. What more do we want?

A problem-centred curriculum

It seems to me then that both from the point of view of the philosophical standing of the social sciences and from that of the student's experience of the subject-matter of those sciences the right thing to do is to start by selecting some substantive problems, problematic questions about society, and then to bombard them with all available methods. In this way one could hope that the student would end up both with some real understanding of the full complexity of at least some major social problems and with sufficient awareness of the strategies of explanation of the different social sciences for him to make informed decisions about which, if any, of them are worth pursuing in a more specialized, disciplinary way. Of course there are awkward decisions to be made about which problems to include in one's curriculum - although these are no more difficult than the choices that would have to be made between disciplines if one decided to proceed in a non-integrated way. I am not sure that it matters very much what problems are included and personally I would let the choice be guided by two things: one's sense of 'the questions sixth-formers actually ask', in so far as it can

be at all well-informed, and, more important, the extent to which the selected problems can be studied by a genuinely wide range of disciplines - the more disciplines that can be effectively brought to bear on a given problem, the stronger the case for including that problem in one's curriculum. The ideal would be to highlight both the methodological distinctiveness of the disciplines and their substantive complementariness at the same time. This leaves a fair range of problems to choose from of course. My own selection, in addition to the question of employment and unemployment, would be wealth and poverty, youth and age and what might be called the process of becoming and being bad (delinquent socialization).

Who is the curriculum for?

Professor Abrams then turned to a consideration of the students for whom such a curriculum was envisaged. Sixth-formers were not a homogeneous population, and with the raising of the school leaving age there would be more diversity still. He identified at least four possible categories of students:

> those who would go on to study one or more specialized social science at university;
>
> those who would go to university to study non-social-science subjects;
>
> those who may be potential social workers and social administrators;
>
> and 'students who expect no further academic or applied involvement with the social sciences, but who will nevertheless find themselves in a succession of more or less intractable social organizations and social relationships.'

Was it possible to construct one syllabus which would adequately serve all these groups? He thought that the type of problem-centred approach which he outlined could do this, if it was effectively aimed at the third category of students:

> If we put together a syllabus sensitive to the concerned but relatively undisciplinary interests of this type of student I think we could also satisfy the needs of each of the other types at this level. We should reach a maximum school audience and at the same time leave the field clear for the development of specialized discipline-based work in the universities - avoiding the kind of duplication of school and university courses which has been such a problem in economics. This approach also has the great advantage of creating a generally more scientific setting for both professional and lay attitudes to the problems of social work and social administration. One of the things which is badly needed in this country is any sort of public culture and language to serve as a medium for the widespread discussion of social policy issues. It is this which I see as the long-run contribution of a problems-and-methods-based social science curriculum in schools. What would be shared in such a culture would of course be a technical capacity to apprehend, and a moral acceptance of the credibility of certain modes of inquiry, not substantive mastery of any particular bodies of knowledge.

This, he thought, was the right answer to the question before the conference, 'On what basis should integration take place?' Finally, Professor Abrams turned to what he considered to be the important substantive core of a school syllabus:

> The social sciences may be viewed as a difiuse, many-sided effort to reconceptualize the common-sense experience of what is problematic in society in the terms of science. Two properties of that experience can be said to be pervasively and fundamentally problematic, to constitute, at least in a historical sense, the root problems of the social sciences. These are, on the one hand, the reality of society and, on the other, the meaning of personal action. Perhaps the clearest general statement of the theoretical centrality of these problems of fact and meaning, constraint and purpose, in the social sciences is still to be found in Hobbes' Leviathan. What we have done since Hobbes, is to make great progress in the business of identifying and explaining specific manifestations of these basic properties of social experience in the terms of science. Works like The Social Order of the Slum by Suttles, or Bowlby's Attachment and Loss, or Soulside by Hannertz, or Gardiner's The Politics of Corruption clarify the relatedness of fact and meaning in given social settings with dramatic cogency*. But they do so because in addition to being addressed directly to this central issue of the social sciences they intrude a strict language of scientific conceptualization and evaluation between the issue and the everyday understanding of it This fusion of substance and method should surely be a primary strategic objective for a sixth-form syllabus. There is no point in teaching the social sciences at all unless at the end of the course one has established the heuristic power of the procedures of science, at least in a general sense and supported by the effective analysis of some specific problems. For this reason I would be inclined to think that having made a concession to common sense and everyday experience in one's choice of subject-matter one should then be fairly ruthless in proceeding at once to fairly abstract, esoteric and difficult methods of analysis. The social science syllabus if it gets into the school curriculum at all will certainly get only limited time. If one is really to do justice to any number of disciplines it will be necessary not only to be very selective in one's choice of substantive problems but also, having in a sense gone in at the shallow end, so far as subject-matter is concerned, to plunge straight into the deep end when it comes to methodology - to recognize that this is where the real learning effort will have to be made. Fortunately this procedure is not just the one that recommends itself on grounds of practical convenience. It is also the one that seems most likely to make possible the kind of learning that will explain why an integrated social science syllabus was worth attempting in the first place.

---

* The Social Order of the Slum: Ethnicity and Territory in the Inner City by G. D. Suttles (Studies in Urban Sociology, University of Chicago Press, 1969); Attachment and Loss by J. Bowlby (Hogarth Press and Institute of Psycho-analysis, 1969); Soulside: Inquiries into Ghetto Culture and Community by V. Hannertz (Columbia University Press, 1971); and The Politics of Corruption by J. A. Gardiner (Russell Sage Foundation, 1970).

III. THE NATURE AND LOGIC OF INTEGRATION

The three speakers who had been invited to explore this issue, came from three different areas of education: secondary school, university, and further education. All had experience of the processes involved in planning integrated courses, which it was thought would provide useful comparative study for possible work at sixth-form level.

Work at Thomas Bennett School, Crawley*

Peter Mitchell was able to tell the conference about a most carefully thought out secondary-school interdisciplinary course organized for the fourth and fifth years at Thomas Bennett School. It is reproduced very fully here as it raises many of the issues which would be involved in a similar enterprise in the sixth form.

He started by describing the context in which the new curriculum was developed. Thomas Bennett is a very large mixed comprehensive school, 'uncreamed' which had initially been run as if it was a large streamed grammar school. In the last six years some major changes had been implemented, notably the teaching of the first year in four house groups; this allowed for mixed ability teaching and the organization of a faculty structure within which it became possible for individual subject departments to co-operate more fully.

The course to be described was developed within the humanities faculty, which grouped together history and social science, geography, home economics and religious education. At first an integrated curriculum was confined to lower ability fourth- and fifth-year children and was designed to meet the new demands created by the raising of the school leaving age; but this was soon seen as unsatisfactory, not least because it was a way of using the curriculum to divide children of different abilities. It did, however, initiate the idea of staff working as a team, and clarified the need to expand the social science department to include, 'one anthropologist-cum-sociologist, one economist-cum-sociologist and one sociologist and one psychologist' - a range of disciplines made possible by the size of the school.

Peter Mitchell went on to describe the development three years ago of the present course, covering children of all levels of ability. Of particular relevance to this conference is his discussion of the relation between the disciplines:

---

* Peter Mitchell wished to acknowledge the contribution of Mr John Beck in the preparation of his paper.

We were determined to pursue the idea of the common curriculum representing history, geography and social sciences and thus to avoid a proliferation of single social science disciplines that would be set against history and geography in a system of curriculum options. Underlying our planning was the idea that we could help children develop a greater knowledge and understanding of their contemporary society and other societies if the disciplines of history, geography, economics, sociology, anthropology and psychology were co-ordinated in a programme that reflected the interrelationships that exist between these disciplines. This coming together of the disciplines, does not, as is sometimes supposed, mean a loss of identity for the disciplines but necessitates a thoughtful consideration of their structure. Structure is used here to mean firstly, the body of concepts which defines the subject-matter of the discipline and controls its inquiries and secondly, the validation process or inquiry method used by the discipline. We spent one year planning the humanities programme and our first important problem arose over the association of history with social science within it. The very use of the title 'humanities faculty' is deceptive because of the exclusion of English literature and the inclusion of social science.

There were members of the history department who felt history should define its place in the curriculum alongside English where its literary and artistic qualities could realize their importance as components in historical studies. Comparable with this idea was the argument that the models used in some social science studies are by their very nature exclusive of particulars and they are thus only of marginal value to the study of unique events in history. Many social scientists may read into these arguments a desire for self preservation by historians who, with no clearly defined conceptual framework, fear that the questions they ask may be subsumed by questions asked in more clearly defined discipline structures, namely the social sciences. There is no doubt that this is a premature fear, but there remains a persistent wariness between social scientists on the one hand and students of history and literature on the other. To see social science as exclusively concerned with quantifying aspects of human behaviour reducing men to characters within an allegory is, however, as unrepresentative a picture of social science as the picture of the historian being exclusively anthropomorphic about men, seeking out only the unique features of man's past behaviour and experience. The points of similarity between history and the social sciences are as much in need of emphasis as are the distinctions I have drawn. The historian's concern with many fundamental social science concepts and his use of techniques of inquiry associated with the social sciences is not surprisingly prevalent today in economic, social and demographic history. In developing a humanities programme we have been concerned with drawing out these points of distinction and similarity and our hopes for the future of the programme are enhanced by the feeling that the association of history with the social sciences will enable us to develop, for the child, a more balanced understanding of the content chosen for study than would have been the case if we had concerned ourselves exclusively with either of the discipline areas mentioned to the arbitary exclusion of the other.

He then considered the reasons for introducing social science into the curriculum including a detailed justification for the inclusion of social anthropology:

> Our decision to introduce social science into the curriculum came initially from an awareness that religious studies, history and literature were between them inadequately meeting the need for children to be equipped to make their personal judgements about choices on moral, political and religious issues, with a clear understanding of the personal and social consequences of the ramifications of such choices. This is one of the three principal aims for including social science in the curriculum, the other two being, first the need to equip students to understand as completely as possible the nature of the society in which they are living, as well as the societies amongst which they are living in a shrinking world; and second, the need to understand the place of the individual in society: how social forces affect individuals and how individuals affect social change. The social sciences have developed a body of distinctive concepts and patterns of understanding centrally relevant to these aims. We consider these aims appropriate in a society characterized by a variety of value systems, and at a time of heightened social change. It is also appropriate to emphasize that the content of the curriculum is a matter of value judgements rather than an empirical or logical matter. Having defined three important curriculum aims for our school, we have judged the inclusion of social science to be essential if we are to meet these aims.
>
> Of the social sciences, the contribution of social anthropology is perhaps least understood and yet in many American social studies projects such as Bruner's course on 'man',* cross cultural studies form an integral part of the course. How can social anthropology help us to meet our aims?† It firstly introduces children to knowledge about pre-industrial non-European societies putting emphasis on ethnographic data rather than on the interpretations of anthropologists. In so doing, it has the potential of eroding ethnocentricism (anthropologists' jargon meaning 'the prevailing illusion that one's own society and culture is the only one that really matters and that one can analyse all others quite readily in terms of values and categories of the west'). Thus a more detached attitude to western as well as exotic societies may be developed, based upon a solid respect for evidence. Children can be helped to examine their own prejudices from a new standpoint, e.g. gross prejudices such as 'wogs are ignorant, uncivilized and don't know how to behave decently' (in terms of our cultural standards) and more concealed and pervasive prejudices, e.g. that their own individual system of values and ideas is natural and self evidently right. The point is that they do feel natural and right: we have been socialized into them. But it is salutary to compare the socialization process in other cultures with that in our own.
>
> Social anthropology is particularly well equipped for the role of

---

* Jerome Bruner, Man: a Course of Study (Education Development Center, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1967).

† These arguments for including anthropology in the curriculum are based upon the conclusion of a meeting of the Royal Anthropologists Society at LSE in 1964.

assisting students to examine the grounds of their most basic and often unconscious assumptions precisely because it deals with examples that are remote and exotic. It is for this purpose that Bruner has used anthropology. The studies of exotic peoples impersonalize the problem to some extent and consequently disarm resistance. This can help the assimilation of sociological data which may meet resistance because it involves an element of self discovery.

This comparative perspective offered by anthropology may be seen as complementary to the temporal perspective of the historian. Both encourage the same critical examination of ourselves, our assumptions, and current trends.

A second contribution of anthropology lies in the study of small-scale societies which may help to illustrate what society is and how it is structured and organized more readily than through the study of fragments of large complex industrial ones. Thirdly the variety of cultural data enables anthropologists to analyse comparatively the different ways by which different peoples meet the essential requirements of survival as human societies; that is to show the general principles underlying the uniqueness of each society. It is in this respect that it is difficult to make any useful distinction between social anthropology and sociology: both use the same set of inter-related concepts to analyse their data.

After a discussion of the pupils for whom the course was designed - 'we had in mind a terminal course for those who would have little further opportunity to discuss the issue involved'- Mr Mitchell turned to a consideration of what he called course objectives, which he distinguished from general aims:

Statements made about general aims are a general declaration of intent which gives direction to the teaching programme and helps to clarify why we teach social science and history. When we come to think in terms of what will have been achieved when the programme has been taught we are thinking in terms of course objectives. An important reason for introducing curriculum innovation in the fourth and the fifth years was our dissatisfaction with what pupils had achieved at the completion of Mode I on history, geography and commerce. This is achievement in terms of cognitive development and not in terms of grades. The breadth of content to be covered forced teachers to use an excessive degree of didactic teaching thus stifling the pupils' initiative in the learning situation. This is a generalization which may be challenged but in schools with pupils of less than the highest ability, who feel it their responsibility to help their pupils to high grades, it usually holds true. It was clear to us that the humanities programme would necessitate a wider range of modes of learning than our previous teaching; our intention to be more explicit about attitudes and values, for example, draws attention to the need for pupils to have the opportunity for discussion.

In considering the structures of disciplines in the programme we clarified the twin importance of concepts and validation process.

Without an understanding of social science concepts such as 'socialization', 'role' and 'social stratification', pupils would be unable to undertake inquiries with any degree of independence. To achieve an understanding of these concepts while being aware of a need to test assumptions about them is thus a critical first objective. The development of inquiry skills was specified as our second objective being drawn again from our original consideration of the structures of disciplines. Lists of cognitive skills by such curriculum experts as Bloom* apply to the thought processes in all disciplines. Our special concern with the social sciences and history emphasized the need to specify those elements of cognitive learning which were part of the proof process employed by the social sciences and to organize them into sequential and coherent steps. This mode of inquiry is outlined in 'Steps in the mode of enquiry for social studies' [see Appendix A]. Those of you familiar with work of Fenton† will recognize it as the one developed at the Carnegie Curriculum Centre. It will be clear that we have assumed that while social sciences are divided on the basis of of their subject-matter they are united by their methods of inquiry. To summarize, we have committed ourselves to emphasizing the teaching of ways of working rather than the acquisition of knowledge although I trust it is clear that the choice of substantive areas for study will remain crucial for the success of the programme.

Mr Mitchell then raised some of the difficulties involved in embarking on a 'methods' course in the fourth and fifth years:

Curriculum planning should involve organizing learning not only within topics studied but within the whole programme and within the three secondary school years prior to the programme. By innovating in the fourth and fifth years, we neglected the importance of learning in the years prior to the programme and being conscious of the children's inadequate preparation for inquiry, we have had to restrict the opportunity for free inquiry, putting the emphasis on guided inquiry. As a mode of learning, guided inquiry, whereby children are presented with evidence through which teacher-produced worksheets guide them, has also been prominent because children had had no previous opportunity to use and understand the concepts of social science. We thus wished to be fairly systematic in the way in which we assessed the usefulness of the evidence studied for developing an understanding of these social science concepts. You will no doubt appreciate the fact that materials from sociology, anthropology and psychology that have been shown to be of value in the secondary schools are few in number. Perhaps predictably we have also met with problems of developing a conceptual understanding of social science studies with children we define as lower ability. The stereotyped patterns of behaviour and attitudes of work of these children, which we hoped would to some extent be offset by being embraced within a common programme for all children, are conditioned by their experiences as lower block children in their first three

---

* B. S. Bloom (ed.), Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: the Classification of Educational Goals. Handbook 1: Cognitive Domain (Longmans Green, 1956).

† E. Fenton Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools (Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1966).

years in the school. Nevertheless, we have been aware that some of our difficulties result from over emphasis on written evidence and a reluctance to explore 'common-sense' introductions to themes under study.

He then gave us an exposition of the way in which the course was organized, which involved three basic modes of presentation:

(1) Key lessons which were lecture sessions in which topics were introduced - 'Usually prepared by the specialist in a particular discipline and include the use of a variety of media in the form of slides, overhead projector transparencies, etc.'

(2) The guided inquiry already mentioned, consisting of evidence in a variety of forms including ethnographic data, statistics, the reports of surveys by sociologists, newspapers, etc. Each piece of evidence was accompanied by worksheets, which suggested types of questions which could be put in order to analyse, evaluate and interpret the data.

(3) The third important mode of learning involved project work or free inquiries. These were undertaken towards the end of the first two terms in the fourth year and were seen as essential in giving pupils confidence to inquire independently into subjects they have some control over. All three modes of inquiry were used again in the fifth year and Mr Mitchell described the difficulty that had been experienced in balancing the use of each; in particular in making project work a fruitful mode of learning an inquiry method.

Final discussion of the Thomas Bennett course dealt with an aspect relevant to the development of the social sciences at all levels - the need for a resource centre and the problems of gathering suitable resources. At the Thomas Bennett School they had gathered twenty kits of materials to support the programme, which had to be stored in a suitable way for use in an interdisciplinary course and be available to a large number of pupils.

> The initiative we are looking for from the pupils demands a resource centre capable of storing written evidence, slides and tapes and providing facilities for individual learning. It is impossible to underestimate the importance of the working environment to the successful teaching of inquiry methods. Specialist rooms are traditionally provided for geography but the concept must now be applied to history and the social sciences. An analogy may be drawn with the existing situation in natural sciences where laboratories are considered essential to the teaching of inductive inquiry. Pupils will have access to the resource centre, which will be the permanent home for all materials; it is also intended that kits of materials will be transferred to classrooms on trolleys that will convert the classroom into an extension of the resource centre. In this way classrooms will have a comparable function to that of a laboratory. As I have already implied, the collection of appropriate materials, for inclusion in the resource centre, is a prerequisite for successful inquiry. The use of documents in the new history publications is an encouraging trend that suggests that support for historical inquiries in schools is improving. The situation in social science is less helpful,

> particularly if a school wishes to integrate the teaching of sociology, anthropology and psychology. Knowing where to find the most appropriate ethnographic material and how to present it so that it is comprehended, while retaining its original ideas, values, etc., is a task for the specialist. An important distinction needs to be drawn between the act of curriculum planning, which specifies the way in which innovation of this kind can be planned so that such important considerations as definition of aims, objectives, teaching media and pattern of learning can be made and the act of defining the content to be taught and organizing this content in sequence appropriate to the patterns of learning specified. The latter task is the one I wish to emphasize as appropriate to the specialists in the disciplines involved in the curriculum innovation. The strength of much American innovation in history and the social sciences has been its ability to draw on the support of university specialists in these disciplines.

Mr Mitchell concluded his talk by making some observations directly related to sixth-form social sciences. He started by raising the issue discussed by Professor Abrams - that of the relation between school and university courses:

> Discussing the development of a social science course at advanced level reflects the need to consider the arbitrary choices which would be made by pupils if social science disciplines continued to expand at advanced level. There is also the greater possibility of the single disciplines over-formalizing content and in the search for respectability developing courses which overlap with first-year university work. Psychology as a single advanced level discipline has recently been introduced, as an advanced level course at Thomas Bennett School and after one year of running the course we are having to restrict its teaching to only a small number of pupils with ability in maths and biology. This implies the restriction of this course to a minority of those advanced level students who would express an interest in social science studies in the sixth form. An interdisciplinary methods-based course would improve the relationship between sixth-form and university work by emphasizing the preparation of students for the greater autonomy they will have in their studies when they go to university, college, etc. It would be unfortunate if the criticisms of advanced level courses in economics and government, expressed by many university dons, were to be generally extended to all advanced courses in the social sciences.

He also raised an issue which became of great significance in the rest of the conference, that of the lack of consensus within and between social science disciplines as to their nature and perspectives. Due to the need to limit the course to one-third of the advanced level programme, he suggested restricting it to sociology, social anthropology and social psychology:

> In the early development of such a course it would only be possible to consider it as one-third of the advanced level programme taken by the majority of students, giving it parity of importance with the single disciplines already established in the sixth-form

curriculum. If such a course is to avoid superficiality the range of content to be covered will have to be narrower than in conventional advanced level courses. Even by emphasizing methodological common ground it could not hope to cover adequately economics or large sections of psychology: at Thomas Bennett with examination provision of three O-level grades, we have not effectively included psychology nor physical geography. Exploring the range of disciplines to be included will inevitably suggest a number of alternative combinations; the quality of work in the disciplines should be enhanced by association with other disciplines in the chosen combination. In other words it should be a natural coming together where concepts are at times shared, where fresh perspectives help new insights and in particular where the comparative element in social science studies is strengthened; I would suggest that such a combination is represented by sociology, social anthropology and social psychology.

The present discussions within sociology on the subject of methods of research suggests that important consideration will have to be given to the question of excluding incompatible approaches within social science. Such distinctions would be points for emphasis in a methods-based social science course in much the same way as the distinctions between the inquiries of different kinds of historians would be drawn out should a methods course be developed in advanced level history.

Finally some general considerations which put the subject within the context of general educational change:

Interdisciplinary work inevitably means working to some extent outside one's discipline, and if social science teachers are to feel secure in the substantive areas they are teaching some choice of content must be built into the course.

Many of the changes currently being experienced in secondary schools are embodied in the type of innovation under discussion. The idea of disciplines being in open relationship to one another and the emphasis on ways of knowing by pupils are important in themselves but they also signify that relationships between teachers are changing more towards team teaching, with joint exercises in course planning, material production and evaluation. They also signify a changing relationship between teacher and child, with the child seeing his own role as demanding greater initiative and planning in the learning situation. I emphasize the ramifications of the innovation so that it is seen in the context of general educational change rather than as a concern exclusively related to social science

Comment

Peter Mitchell presented a most lucid account of the process of curriculum change in his school. Many people will have become aware, perhaps ruefully, of the extent of resources and range of specialist talent which had gone into the development of this course. It was able to develop in a favourable structural context with strong support from the headmaster and thus an availability of time, money and materials inaccessible to many teachers.

The 'logic [illegible] and the objectives of the course had been [illegible] clarity and thoroughness, yet even in this somewhat [illegible] terms of the content and [illegible] over into pragmatic considerations such as: what subjects were grouped together in the faculty, what did the historians think about the [illegible] and vice versa?

There are three problems raised by it which are taken up for discussion later: first [illegible] difficulty raised by the existence of incompatible approaches within the social sciences. Is it really possible to exclude certain approaches or conversely is it possible to avoid them? If not, is this fair to the pupils, who escape confusion only because they get a distorted picture of what they are studying?

Second, the difficulty of basing a course on the 'methods of the social sciences' in a situation in which these methods are currently being [illegible] for relatively senior pupils with little background [illegible] learning in their earlier curriculum. This difficulty emphasises the need to plan a sixth-form course in relation to the [illegible] whole secondary-school experience.

Third, the very exciting emphasis on the contribution of social anthropology to [illegible] education. I would endorse what Peter Mitchell says about its possibilities, for I believe as he does, that its inclusion is an essential part of any integrated social science course. But the best ways of [illegible] anthropology is still a matter for research given the shortage of suitable source materials, and our lack of experience in teaching the subject at school level. We hope that by [illegible] material from other cultures we will help to create [illegible] criticism. But it is possible we may inadvertently [illegible] them with accounts of customs and practices which [illegible] them, or which at least reinforce their preconceptions that [illegible] are so different as to be unnatural'. Such [illegible] the hands of a skilled and sensitive specialist, [illegible] readily available in many schools. Care needs to be taken in the choice of source materials, and in dealing positively with the [illegible] arouse, of the kind of cognitive learning [illegible] which is emphasized in this description of the Nuffield course.

The Open [illegible] in the Social Sciences: a case [illegible] integration

Peter Mitchell [illegible] Fletcher Drake of the Open University who [illegible] introductory social science course at [illegible] and talk by referring to the increasing [illegible] or interdisciplinary courses in social sciences.

He went on to discuss some of the reasons why successful courses are so hard to produce - reasons, as we shall emphasize later, to do with the organization of knowledge in this country - and then launched into an account of the aims of the Open University Course 'Understanding Society' and some of the constraints on its shaping:

> The overriding goal of the Foundation Course 'Understanding Society' was to develop amongst our students the rudiments of what I call 'social science literacy'. The analogy is, of course, with the conventional concept of 'literacy'. With literacy comes a restructuring of the world. The ability to read and write is one of the fundamental skills, so fundamental that one can scarcely imagine an existence in a modern community without it. To suggest that an acquaintance with the insights and the methods of social science involves an equally traumatic change in one's position, would be presumptuous. Nevertheless there are a number of ways by which social science does remodel an individual's perception of the world around him. For instance the social scientist's insistence on a numerical or quantitative analysis of human phenomena, as opposed to an impressionistic, often merely anecdotal one, is potentially revolutionary. The ability to generate and test hypotheses is another equally important skill. The concern with the precise use of concepts and the constant questioning of the conventional wisdom are both subversive acts in the context of any society.
>
> We have sought then, in 'Understanding Society', to carry students through the ABCs (it is after all a Foundation Course) of social science. We have done it by introducing them to the aims, the methods and some of the findings of various social sciences. We have tried to show what they have done, what they can or cannot do, and what the future is likely to bring. We have tried to do this within an essentially interdisciplinary context - rather than a multidisciplinary one. In a multidisciplinary course the disciplines are presented in their own right. Any connexion between them is often arbitrary: for instance, so many hours of one, so many of another. In an interdisciplinary course, on the other hand, the disciplines are not taught in their own right, they are used as vehicles for a goal which subsumes them in some way. As I have indicated our goal was to raise the social science literacy rate. This ideal of an interdisciplinary approach - I must confess now that it was an ideal that was attained only partially - had several implications.
>
> The first of these was that neither the number nor the nature of the disciplines was particularly important. As it happens the team which prepared 'Understanding Society' contained five disciplines: economics, geography, government, psychology, and sociology. But this was partly fortuitous; for instance until a very late stage, the planning committee had thought of having geography in the Humanities Faculty. I myself feel that social sciences could equally easily accommodate history - now in the Humanities Faculty - or statistics, which is now in Mathematics.

What was important then was not the number or the nature of the disciplines contributing to the course, but what they did. At the Open University this was determined partly by the course team, partly by other authorities. An instance of the latter is that the course as a whole should not involve the students in more than 360 hours work: an average, that is, of 10 hours a week over 36 weeks. The course team itself also imposed particular constraints on its various members. For instance the geographers were to present their contribution only from the field of human geography: the psychologists were largely confined to social psychology: the sociologists' role was to cement together the contributions of the various other disciplines. Thus, for instance, they produced a unit (the term given to a week's work) on the sociology of economic behaviour which came after the micro-economic and before the macro-economic units. They also produced one on social stratification that was sandwiched between a unit on the distribution of income, and another on the psychology of social class.

The effect of these, and other constraints was to force the disciplines out of character. They were bent and twisted - tortured, some would say - in order to meet the overriding goal of the course. Naturally when brought together in this way they appear inelegant, stark, even ungainly: the logic of their normal presentation is destroyed. The effect of interdisciplinary endeavour is to cut across disciplines, rub their edges raw. Hopefully, after some years, the new structure will have a logic of its own - but, initially the interdisciplinary course, like the American frontier town, is not a pretty sight.

Finally it was felt that an essential element of social science endeavour was to produce laws applicable to 'man in society', not to particular men in particular societies. Of course this is a dream, unrealizable some would say, and at present there is very little general theory that is not either culture or time bound. But the aim remains. So the 'Understanding Society' course team decided to try and avoid the 'ethnocentric trap' and wherever possible draw illustrations and develop ideas in a non-British, often even a non-Western context. It is interesting that although this was the aim, the course as a whole has a very 'Western' stamp about it!

An outline of the course

The course is designed to cover 36 weeks. Each week involves the study of a particular topic. An indication of what topics are being studied when can be gathered from the following list.

Section 1. Why do people live in societies?

Week		
1	The fundamentals of human nature	Psychology Instinctive and learned behaviour. Man's drives and their relation to societies.

2	Men and government	Political Science The political philosopher's view of the effects of living under government and of various types of governments
3	The economic basis of society	Economics 'Market' and 'command' economics
4	Societies and environments	Geography The relation between societies and their physical environment
5	Man as a social animal	Sociology The examination of two contrasting societies. The need to relate economic, political and territorial facets of behaviour.

Section 2. How do people live in societies?

	Socialization
6	Child socialization
7	Personality development
8	Attitudes and prejudice
9	The family and its functions
	Economy and society
10	Economic wants
11	Production and supply
12	Markets and prices
13	The sociology of economic behaviour
	Money, wealth and class
14	The workings of the economy
15	Money
16	Distribution of incomes
17	Social stratification
18	The psychology of social class
	Spatial aspects of society
19	Rural land use
20	Location of industry
21	Zoning within cities
22	The size and spacing of settlements
23	Approaches to political geography

Government and politics

24 The formal structure of government
25 Informal political institutions
26 Government and politics without the state
27 (i) Political culture, (ii) Politics and political systems
28 Politics in groups

Stability, change and conflict

29 Stability and function in society
30 Social change in society
31 Stability and change in social groups

Section 3. What kind of problems do people face in societies?

The 'population explosion': an interdisciplinary approach

32 The demographer and his world
Demography
The importance of precise methodology and evaluation of data

33 Demographic regions of the Indian sub-continent
Geography
The spatial context of demographic change

34 Economic implications of rapid population growth
Economics
In relation to under-developed economies

35 Social and political implications of rapid population growth
Sociology
Relates back to work on the family and the inter-relations and complexity of human experience

36 The diffusion and acceptance of change
Social psychology, case study
A family planning programme in India. Relates to studies of socialization, attitude change, and group behaviour.

Professor Drake elaborated on this outline by pointing out how it fell into three parts, each subsumed under a particular question, and how the second section differed from the first and third.

Frankly this middle section is a multi- rather than an inter-disciplinary exercise. You will notice that sometimes for two or three weeks a particular discipline is allowed to 'do its thing'. However, even here there is a certain ordering of units, intended to give some structure, and hence a logic, to the section. For example there is broadly speaking a movement from micro- to macro-analysis, both within blocks and within the sections as a whole. It may also be noticed that the actual presentation of the insights of particular disciplines is by no means haphazard.

He then turned to the rationale behind the first and third units:

We see in the former all the disciplines coming together to answer an academic question (using 'academic' here in the pejorative sense) of why people live in societies. The question itself is not especially exciting and with hindsight we now feel we could have done somewhat better. However, it does provide a means of introducing the five disciplines that together form the academic backbone of the course. No attempt is made to mute the differences between the disciplines, but to avoid, so far as possible, their presenting themselves in a random fashion, they are obliged to focus on a common question - why do people live in societies? This question provides a framework and a reference point for the discussion. The coherence of the block is further reinforced by its layout. In the middle weeks, politics, economics and geography each deal with single facets of man's behaviour: man the political animal, man the economic animal, man the territorial animal. In the first and fifth weeks, however, man the social animal is examined - a composite creature. In the fifth week we see how for the sociologist, the social animal is a given, but in the first week a psychologist shows how for him it is precisely the combination of the social and the animal characteristics of man that provide him with one of his main subjects of research. In other words what is an assumption for one discipline (in this case sociology) is often the subject matter of another (in this case psychology). These approaches to the study of man in society are also discussed in the five radio programmes associated with this section of the course. These are an entity in themselves designed to provide a parallel introductory overview of the social sciences and dwell more on the origins of the different disciplines, their methods of inquiry, their success and failures so far, and possible future developments in them. (For illustrations of the approach see the second column of the outline of the course, Section 1.)

In the third and final section of the course we turn to consider another kind of problem, or series of problems, associated with the 'population explosion'. Unlike the 'academic problem' of Section 1, the problems examined here indicate the sensitivity of the social scientist - no matter what his discipline - to problems of immediate public concern. To enhance further the unity of treatment there is a common emphasis on the population problems of the Indian sub-continent. As this section occupies the closing weeks of the course, unit authors have frequently used the phenomenon of the 'population explosion' to point up

some of the main features of earlier blocks. We did not want to do this merely by repeating them, but rather by illustrating them in a new context. (The way in which this is done is shown by the exposition in the second column of the outline of the course, Section 3.)

Finally Professor Drake turned away from questions of 'nature and logic' to what he called 'problems of production'. Some of these were peculiar to the Open University, which has the problem of teaching large numbers of mostly invisible students through a variety of media. Others are general, however, and echo points raised already:

> First there are the problems associated with the fact that due to the long history of specialization in this country and to the fact that the brightest students have specialized most, one can only really produce interdisciplinary courses by bringing a number of people together. Inevitably they bring with them different skills, different experiences. Some are old, some are young. Some have taught adults, some only students of a conventional age. Some are arrogant, others excessively modest. Naturally there are clashes of temperament. The final content of the interdisciplinary course often, I fear, reflects these factors as much as the academic ideals which supposedly underpin it.
>
> Secondly because the interdisciplinary course involves co-operation it reduces the autonomy of the individual teacher and imposes on him a discipline, with regard to the presentation of his materials, that he normally avoids. His writing is now public, his teaching technique is now open for all (at least all his colleagues) to see. I suspect that without careful attention to the kind of tensions this situation gives rise to, many an interdisciplinary course will founder.
>
> Finally there is the question of breathing life into an interdisciplinary course devised by one set of people but, at the grass roots, taught by another. This problem is particularly severe at the Open University but as the list of aims and issues presented to this conference indicates, the questions of 'who is going to teach the course?; what does this mean for materials and methods?; how can the demand for teacher retraining be met?', are pretty general. With regard to 'Understanding Society' we have tried to solve the problem by a careful briefing of part-time class and correspondence tutors, together with a course design that allows a flexible approach. Because, for instance, all disciplines are used to elucidate aspects of social science it follows that one can understand much of the 'mystery' (used here in its medieval sense) of social science, even if one fails to grasp all the intricacies of a particular social science. Unlike mathematics it is not necessary to grasp economics before one proceeds to sociology. Social science itself is not sequential in that way. The Foundation Course makes a virtue of this. That seems a suitably pragmatic note on which to end - bearing in mind always, of course, that interdisciplinary courses, like genius, are 99 per cent perspiration and 1 per cent inspiration.

Comment

Professor Drake was describing a situation even more unusual than Mr Mitchell's; the planning of a completely new course in a new institution, for an unfamiliar group of students and an untried teaching situation. This gave him and his team opportunities to produce a coherent plan unlikely to be present in most sixth forms. There are, however, several general points which arise from his account, which came over even more cogently in his lively spoken presentation than they do here.

First it is becoming increasingly apparent that 'integration' in the programmes described does recognize the autonomy of the disciplines; the very fact of having to focus the disciplines on common themes distorts them in the eyes of the specialists involved, and Professor Drake and his staff found it necessary to have a section in which specialists from each discipline had a chance to 'do their own thing' (a fact he seemed to feel as somewhat of a defeat).

A second point of interest is the way in which the contributions of the disciplines are focused on a 'problem area' in society, a technique which echoes the 'problem-centred curriculum' suggested by Professor Abrams, and is found again in later examples.

Finally, one sensed all through Professor Drake's talk that he was longing to talk more about 'production problems' which had obviously dominated his thinking during the planning of the course. His hints of the trauma and agony undergone in order to get specialist academics to co-operate, reiterates again that 'integrated courses' may be shaped more by the interrelationships of their perpetrators than by philosophical considerations. Again, here are some themes to return to.

Integrated Courses: Experience in Further Education

F. Flower, Principal of Kingsway College of Further Education, was the third speaker of the morning. His paper had been circulated the night before, and he was able to speak round it rather than repeat it. His contribution extended the picture in three ways. First, he pointed out some of the conditions in further education which make curriculum innovation more possible than in other areas of education. Second, the examples he quoted of integrated courses in his own and other colleges were generated in quite different ways from those previously described, and usually ranged beyond the social sciences. Third, he made explicit some of the hints of earlier speakers about the process of curriculum change, by referring them to the theoretical framework of Professor Bernstein in his paper given at a British Sociological Association Conference, and now published.*

---

* 'On the classification and framing of educational knowledge' in Knowledge and Control: New Directions in the Sociology of Education, ed. M. F. D. Young (Collier-Macmillan 1971).

1. The nature of further education

Mr Flower started by pointing out that 'proposals and suggestions that are made with their eye on the school situation may be totally inappropriate in the further education situation' - a relevant reminder, given that the greatest proportion of A-level social science teaching takes place at present in colleges of further education and they might therefore be better staffed and equipped to try out interdisciplinary courses than schools.

He continued by pointing out some of the unique characteristics of further education:

> The strongest asset of further education is perhaps its most misunderstood aspect - the close relationship it has with industry and commerce, and the vocational character of its courses. 'Vocational' is a word used often in a pejorative sense, and therefore, by definition, further education, being largely vocationally directed, must necessarily be somehow less educational or less progressive than the non-vocational activities of schools and universities. It is not possible to discuss in this paper the fallacy embedded in this thinking, but it is important to draw attention to the views expressed elsewhere by people like Eric Robinson and Tyrrell Burgess, who point out that it is the traditional academic approaches that are truly illiberal in that academics do not have to justify what they do in terms of immediate relevance or meaning to a student, but simply by reference to the existence of the academic corpus contained within a discipline. Vocational activity needs to be justified all the time to the student and to anyone sponsoring him on a course in terms of its relevance and meaning. It is, of course, possible to extend this relevance far beyond the immediate need for a given activity or skill, but it must extend in a continuum from the situation in which the student finds himself - the exact reverse of the normal situation under which teaching within the academic tradition takes place. It is therefore likely that there should be some support for the development of the integrated approach within the further education field, but if my argument is correct it will only become strong and meaningful if it takes place not in the so-called liberal or general studies, but in the central areas of the further education student's curriculum.

2. Some integrated courses

It was this responsiveness to outside pressures which had led to the erosion of some of the integrated courses described by Mr Flower, which had developed in liberal and general studies departments. Thus, a course run at City of Bath Technical College, involving 'English specialists, a social scientist, a historian, and two specialists in the practical arts', disappeared because of changing external circumstances:

> Longer staying on at school, the advent of O levels, and later CSE to the secondary modern schools, changes in the regulations for Civil Service promotion and employment, and the growth of liberal studies and general studies as an additional element to formal and traditionally conceived vocational courses - have all played a part in the gradual erosion of this work, which has now disappeared from the college. It is to be emphasized that it is the conditions

in the world outside the college that have brought the change, not a deliberate decision of policy on the part of the liberal studies department.

Another from Kingsway itself declined for the same reason:

> We were able to deploy a wide range of group studies involving co-operation not only of social scientists with English teachers, historians or geographers but on occasion natural scientists as well. In recent years, however, the factors that caused the decline of the courses at Bath have affected the day-release courses at Kingsway. Civil servants have become increasingly interested in qualifications that have a reference outside the service as well as within the service, and the number of students attending purely for what is usually termed 'general education', i.e. courses which do not prepare for any kind of external examination, has diminished almost to vanishing point. This again is not the deliberate policy of the college but the effect of changes in the external environment.

Mr Flower evaluated various experiments in integration, one of which is reproduced in Appendix B because it raises issues which are returned to later. He then turned to a consideration of present thinking at Kingsway:

> Reflecting on this body of experience, and taking stock of the kind of students coming to the college, their motivation, ambitions and likely career prospects, teachers at Kingsway have begun to consider very seriously what kind of integrated studies it would be most useful to promote in the college. The advent of a new building that will be richly endowed with audio-visual hardware has presented us with opportunities of some fundamental thinking about the work we are doing. In particular, teachers of the social sciences, history and English have been discussing means of co-operating to produce integrated courses to support students following independent but related A-level disciplines. Thought is also being given to similar courses at lower levels in the college.
>
> The general principles which seem to be emerging are that it is at present premature to attempt a total merger of A-level courses, not because it would not be possible to devise an intelligent integrated course at this level but because students would not be prepared to abandon their existing lines of study to embark upon a highly experimental activity in their main course. Until one can establish the independence of assessment and evaluation represented by a CNAA degree it would be difficult to persuade students to follow an integrated course. Our thinking, therefore, is to develop supporting courses which students following A levels in sociology, economics, history, psychology and English may find of use and value. These would be topic- or problem-centred, based upon a historical period, a social situation such as juvenile delinquency, a family case history, physical entities like a housing estate, an environmental study, or some combination of such topics. A further extension of our thinking is to organize much of the material for these courses in the form of tapes, slides, folders of extracts, references to books, which can be used either in class or for individual study in the library, which is suitably equipped with carrels and the necessary hardware

to permit this kind of activity. Yet another proposal is that some of the more formal aspects of our teaching, i.e. the kind of lectures that may be given in British Constitution or sociology or economics, might be reduced to sound tape banked in the library, and could be drawn on by students who would follow a study guide, and there might be a gradual shift from the formal instruction in class to more individual study in the library, while the former class periods would be increasingly taken up with various forms of integrated study and seminar. The culmination of this development would be the eventual introduction of Mode III type examinations containing a series of options which would allow a student to choose one or more A levels within the fields covered. This represents a strategy rather than an existing achievement, but, because it is an attempt to tackle the major area of the student's course rather than the ancillary area of liberal studies, may prove slower in achievement but more fundamental in what it does achieve.

In the final part of his talk Mr Flower raised some general questions about the nature and problems of integrated curricula and returned to the particular contribution of further education.

3. Problems of integration and the process of curriculum change

The anxiety that affects academics faced with the idea of integrated studies at school level expresses itself in concern about how the specialist will come to acquire his depth of understanding of the chosen discipline if he moves into 'integrated' activity at too early a stage. The disciplines are real enough. The flow of experience is so total that to understand it we need to cut it into segments and put a grid on the segments to scrutinize them more closely. The mesh of our grid can be fine or coarse; operating like an electronic sieve, it can make a variety of discriminations, rejecting some elements, retaining others. Each discipline deploys its own grid, its own sieve, but the data is common to all. Each discipline historically evolved has its own set of tools, its methodology, its insights, dissecting and analysing its own particular selection of the elements of experience.

The natural anxieties of an academic (which we all no doubt have experienced at one time or another) appear when the traditional ways of acquiring skill in our special way of knowing are threatened. While we may recognize the value of integration in practical projects, for example research, and its value as a mode of teaching at other levels, we may experience doubt about it as a teaching approach at our own particular level. We have been socialized as specialists and we find it difficult to conceive how we ourselves could have become what we are except by the route we have followed.

This partly accounts for the fact that most examples of integrated studies occur in low status areas in education or in work tangential to a main field. Thus experience in liberal studies in further education, while interesting, has only a limited relevance to the basic discussion. It may provide an area of experience but it will not normally offer any challenge to the main structure of the way things are ordered in British education.

It was for this reason that Mr Flower had taken his main examples from courses which at the time they were set up were central to the curriculum. He continued:

There is another difficulty that needs to be noted. To make integrated studies safe for traditionalists, they have somehow to be assimilated into the existing patterns of curricula organization and pedagogical relationships.

If we organize a problem-centred approach and the distinctive tools and insights are identified and docketed through practice, we should be moving away from the traditional paradigm of learning to a new one.

If, on the other hand, we succumb to Hirstian theories of a liberal education and the need to acquire ways of knowing, not for the elucidation of immediate problems but as part of the mental equipment of a liberal man, we may be merely underwriting a new version of what Bernstein calls 'the collection code'.* I suspect the appeal of this concept of liberal education to some people is in fact a way of defusing and making safe the otherwise revolutionary potential of integrated approaches. Even if we plump for integration but confine our integrated activity to a well-defined field - the social sciences, for example - we could be redrawing subject boundaries only to present a new version of the collection code. It is interesting to note that all the Kingsway examples of attempts at integration went beyond the boundaries normally associated with the social sciences.

A further point to be considered is the degree to which the student has a right to reject any section of a curriculum that is offered to him. The very nature of an integrated approach could lead to the tyranny of a teacher-planned course, and its imposition upon the student. This would represent the triumph of academicism in the sense that it is characterized by Eric Robinson:

> 'Within academic education anything is justifiable because the academic subject (although initially a pure creature of imagination and convenience) has become an end in itself - we learn it because it is there.'

A liberal studies programme, however 'integrated', in further education, that accepts its place alongside a traditionally organized technical course and decides arbitrarily on a range of activities in which there is no room for students to select preferences, is to be referred ultimately to the collection code rather than the integrated one. Perhaps the main contribution of further education to this discussion, and of Kingsway College of Further Education in particular, lies in a rather different direction, and refers to future possibilities rather than past or present actuality.

---

* A 'collection' code refers in Bernstein's terminology to the type of curriculum common in English and European schools in which the boundaries between disciplines are firm - in other words there is strong differentiation between subject areas. as opposed to the situation in an integrated curriculum in which subject boundaries may be blurred and weakened. See M.F.D. Young (ed.), Knowledge and Control: New Directions in the Sociology of Education, p.51.

Bernstein talks about the relation between commonsense knowledge and academic knowledge. He suggests that the collection type of curriculum very early in the child's life socializes him into conceptions of knowledge and its boundaries which discourage connection with everyday realities. I would like to suggest that examination of the tradition in further education might begin to reveal new ways of linking commonsense knowledge with educational knowledge. This should be possible because the tradition in further education is vocational, and its approach practical. Its starting point should be the growing experience of the student and the relevance of what is learnt to that growing experience; it is sustained by the widening aspirations of the student. We know, of course, that in practice courses in further education do not conform to the ideal that these statements suggest. Vocation can shrink to job-training, and philistinism and the dead hand of academicism reach down into the most practical curriculum.

The other contribution of further education stems from its machinery of control. It may be exemplified by the fact that the new articles of government offer means to staff and students of changing the situation within which curriculum planning and activity is being undertaken. In other words, it may be easier in further education than it is in the school to establish new relationships between staff and students which permit the inauguration of forms of integrated activity in the main areas of the curriculum.

Lastly, Kingsway's tradition of student choice and an elective curriculum that has been able successfully to penetrate the major areas of study, while still only representing at this stage a variant of the collection code, nevertheless may permit successful new development of the integrated pattern. Our failure with a course at Kingsway in urban studies derived not from the exciting forms of activity which it undertook. The pedagogy involved was of the kind characterized by Bernstein in the paper quoted above as self-regulatory and 'likely to transform the teacher-pupil, lecturer-student authority relationships, and in particular increase the status and rights of the pupils.' Unfortunately, while it did in fact do this for those that accepted the areas of investigation, it ignored the needs of and offered no alternatives to those students who had different orientations. In the ongoing discussions mentioned at the end of the last section of this paper a strategy is being evolved that should take account of individual student need and common areas of experience which may reinforce those needs.

The issues raised in the last part of this paper, and the conceptualization of them used by Mr Flower, will be returned to in the final commentary. That the kinds of limited pragmatically-based curricular changes covering varied subject content referred to in some of his examples may be particularly possible in the flexible situation of further education, is reinforced by the work from Loughton described in Chapter II.

Commentary by Lawrence Stenhouse

At the end of the morning, participants in the conference may have felt somewhat overwhelmed. They had sat and listened to three stimulating speakers with little time for questioning, discussion or assimilation. Mr Stenhouse

had the unenviable task of drawing together threads from the contributions so far and offering some guidance on themes that could be discussed by the small groups in the afternoon.

Mr Stenhouse started by saying that the task of curriculum development projects was the translation of aspirations into possibilities, possibilities which once pioneered and demonstrated in a number of schools were then so documented and supported with materials and research that they became part of the public tradition of education and thus generally accessible to teachers. On this interpretation, the major problem before the conference was to define the aspirations clearly enough to give a lead to the Schools Council as to how it could best help teachers to make them into practical possibilities.

Turning to the aims and issues paper, he said that there appeared to be some uncertainty as to whether we should emphasize integration or social science. Some had wanted to emphasize integration, canvassing the possibilities of integrating, for example, social science and English and expressing their concern for an integrated study which would provide a basis for social integration in the school. On the other hand, an interest has also been expressed in integrated social science. This was seen in intellectual terms rather than in terms of social education - though, of course, the contrast can be overstressed. If we followed Professor Abrams, the aim of such a social-science course would be to give students some understanding of the value of a study of human social behaviour and social problems in terms of science.

The integration approach looked towards a kind of sixth-form general studies: the social science approach was an attempt to extend the range of options open to sixth-formers at a stage of education when a degree of curricular choice on the part of the student was generally favoured. Social science would take its place alongside other sixth-form subjects.

It was most important to be clear about which direction the conference felt we should go. Bearing in mind the projects already in existence - particularly the Sixth-form General Studies Project at York - Mr Stenhouse felt that the conference would do well to concentrate on the social science strand.

He then turned to the problem of understanding in the social sciences. Presumably a social science curriculum would be concerned with knowledge and understanding. Knowledge could probably fairly readily be specified: a range of facts, concepts and methods; but it was understanding which gave knowledge meaning. As Professor Abrams stressed, the social sciences were concerned with the link between the reality of society and personal meaning, and it was this link which provided understanding. Thus understanding might be seen as mediating between the public and the personal, as relating the public knowledge which was the discipline of social science, to both personal knowledge and personal needs and interests. This process was little understood and required thoughtful study.

Mr Stenhouse then turned to the problem of the range of subjects which would be integrated and the means of integrating them.

It had been suggested that the core of an integrated course would be sociology, social psychology and anthropology. Around this core it might be possible to organize elements of political science, and economics. There was also some possibility of integrating history and geography into such a course but here the conference had already shown that there was less agreement.

The organizational principles of an integrated curriculum also needed to be examined. One possibility was to take one of the contributory subjects as a core round which to build the others. Another was to work in topics. For example, sport as a topic had historical possibilities, was sociologically interesting in itself and in its relation to social structure and stratification, introduced the theory of games, raised problems about rules and law, and related to urban studies. Another possibility was to use methodologies - sampling or survey design or case study, for example - as integrating principles. Yet another was to start from problems or questions - for example, the relation between men and their artefacts.

Courses designed on such principles were often 'inelegant', ragged at the edges. Was this an advantage or a disadvantage? Should courses be rounded and complete or should they leave loose ends which tempted curiosity? In either case there should be logical structure: it was a matter of closed or open structure, not structure versus lack of structure.

Another problem was the kind of data to be used. In particular, what observational experience could we give to students and how? Should films - both fiction and documentary - and novels be used as a substitute for direct observation and raw data? What was the place of fieldwork and to what extent was useful fieldwork possible given the constraints of time? What kinds of laboratory experience could be devised?

Turning to the problem of the production of materials, Mr Stenhouse speculated as to whether the day of the project producing materials on a large scale might not be over, at least for the present. The function of such projects had been to support 'new' subjects or new integrations and to explore new formats which were now accessible to publishers.

American experience had shown that it was almost prohibitively expensive to produce first-class social science material, particularly film. Perhaps a social science project should concentrate on making teachers aware of suitable existing material, arranging that it should be available and stimulating commercial publishers and film companies to produce suitable materials on their own account. A project might concentrate on teachers' handbooks and perhaps on particular innovatory materials such as educational games, which in any case could do with further evaluation.

At the same time any project should give attention to the logic of teaching integrated social science. It was sometimes felt that teachers were given greatest freedom when logical structure was not presented. Mr Stenhouse believed this to be incorrect: the more logic there was inherent in the curriculum the more accessible it would be to teachers, because given logical structure teachers could criticize and modify in an informed way.

Finally, there would be problems of teacher training both in the content of a social science course and in method of approach. There was the question of who would teach social science at this level. Would teachers necessarily have a social science training or would some of them enter the field from other but cognate subjects? It was important to produce a core of teachers who had developed scientific curiosity about society and human behaviour and would be capable of inculcating a sense of standards in the social science field.

Summing up, Mr Stenhouse suggested that the conference address itself mainly to social science (rather than mainly to integration), and within that brief it should consider principles of integration, and how various subjects could contribute within those principles. It should also consider how observational experience was to be provided, what support was necessary in giving teachers access to appropriate materials, how methods were to be developed and what solution could be found to problems of training.

IV. SOME IMPLICATIONS OF CURRICULUM CHANGE

It had already become clear during the first day of the conference that the division between 'nature and logic' and 'practical problems' was not a realistic one. Those of us responsible for planning the second day's programme preferred to focus it more broadly on the implications of curriculum change, some of them practical and some less so. I opened the day's proceedings by introducing the viewpoint of the speakers. They did not conceive of effective curriculum innovation as being worked out logically by some high-powered team and accepted by teachers in schools; but rather as an on-going process of interaction, a dialogue amongst those involved, who must essentially be the teachers themselves. This dialogue takes place in a given organizational context and between a given group of people each with their own status, ideology and previous patterns of conflict or co-operation. Thus, like all social change, it has consequences beyond its immediate intended ones; some of these had already been indicated by previous speakers and we hoped to explore them further.

The focus of the day's speakers was, therefore, on the process of change, how it is generated and some of its consequences. This was examined at two levels: first, in the education of intending teachers of the social sciences; and second, in a detailed account of the development of integrated curricula within one college. Between the two levels it was hoped some common themes would arise.

The first speaker, Mrs Jean Jones, of the University of London Institute of Education, talked about an initial training course for sociology graduates run jointly by her and me. This was not a detailed description of the content of the course (though this was available for those interested), nor an abstract account of aims and methods (for these were not ordained beforehand, but arose in the context of the teaching situation). She aimed instead at a middle level of interpretation, a kind of analysis of the interaction between ourselves and the students during the year and its bearing on the professional identities they develop. This should be very relevant to the subject of the conference for if we want integrated curricula we must produce teachers with enough flexibility to initiate, teach and evaluate them.

Joan Whitehead and Margaret Shepherd of Loughton College of Further Education then described the development of 'integrated' courses at O and A level at Loughton, with some interpretation of the processes at work and the consequences for students and teachers.

Finally I pointed out the nature of the links between the four of us. Joan Whitehead and Margaret Shepherd had both done their initial training at the Institute of Education, Joan in our department and Margaret in the English department. We used Loughton College for students on teaching practice and Joan Whitehead was currently a part-time tutor in our department responsible for supervision of practising students. These links are not fortuitous but in themselves indicate something about the interactive

processes that build up between common understanding which makes innovation possible. They are also an example of the dialogue between theory and practice which Mrs Jones described in her talk.

The education of graduate teachers of the social sciences

Mrs Jones began by outlining the three main parts of her talk. Her central concern was to consider some of the possible effects of movements to integrated curricula upon teachers and those involved in teacher education. 'I shall be dealing with what it is like to be a teacher involved in the process of integration, and by implication how we can help students to be prepared to involve themselves in it.' She wished to begin by taking some theoretical perspectives from Bernstein's paper on the classification and framing of educational knowledge* and from papers delivered at a symposium at the University of Pennsylvania in 1967† as the basis for a dialogue between theory and practice.

Secondly, she would give an interpretation of work in a social sciences graduate training department, which might open up for discussion the possibilities and problems involved in the incorporation of integrated work at this stage; and third she would make a brief comment on the necessity for extending and redefining our notions of training at all levels, if we wished to pay more than lip-service to either integration, or the education of teachers.

She then continued to consider her first theme in more detail:

> Perhaps I can begin with an example of what might occur during a shift to integration, which will demonstrate both the exciting and the taxing nature of the problems we have to look at. A movement to problem centred work, when the disciplines are presented to students as perspectives to be utilized, changes both the student's relationship to the knowledge, and to the teacher. The teachers may, through work of this kind, be led to change their definitions of the students and the new definitions may involve quite different notions of, for example, the students' ability and their involvement. These changes in the students' and in the teachers' perceptions are likely to have been unspecifiable in advance. They may have existed as ideals, but, as some educational philosophers remind us, ideals are unsuitable for practical guidance.

Mrs Jones went on to point out that changes in students' and teachers' perceptions of each other and of their task inevitably demanded changes in the process of assessment. Thus at the Institute and at Loughton, teachers and students increasingly came to criticize and modify traditional course examinations.

She then explored further 'the dialogue between theory and practice' she had referred to at the beginning:

> Around what problems, one might a dialogue arise? First, the changed nature of the individual teacher's autonomy, through a

---

* B. Bernstein, 'On the classification and framing of educational knowledge' in Knowledge and Control: New Directions in the Sociology of Education, ed. M.F.D. Young (Collier-Macmillan, 1971).

† Interdisciplinary Relationships in the Social Sciences ed. M. Sherif and C.W. Sherif (Aldine, 1969).

> ... relationship both to students and to colleagues. The discretion of the individual with regard to content and to method is diminished. These relationships are central to the teacher's professional identity, and therefore what is involved is a change in this identity.

A second issue was the relational idea, the explication of the organizing principles of integration. Murray Wax, in his Pennsylvania paper*, made a pertinent statement here, when he said that 'as social scientists we realize that logic is seldom the best organizer of social relationships and, therefore, the appeal to logic or to the self-evidence of the relations between parts of the curriculum is indulging in mythology or ideology.' Such a view was in obvious contradiction to much that was current in our thinking and that was why it was of value within a dialogue. The account from Loughton, which she felt was not untypical, brought into question the exclusive reliance on logical relationships as a basis for integration. This might be somewhat disturbing for it forced us to question not only our present arrangements and what we wished to change, but the way in which such changes should be effected. It might help, however, if we kept in mind that the conventional notions of the relationship between theory and practice were indeed only conventions. Without such a reminder, discussion of principles of integration could either become an academic parlour game with no relation to practice, or might be expected to produce an exclusive guide to action.

A third focus which paralleled the changed authority relationship between teacher and taught was a changed notion of what could and could not be taught, i.e. the relationships of so-called common sense and educational knowledge. As an illustration of this, Mrs Jones gave a short extract from a recent work of Richard Peters, the educational philosopher: 'Enjoying and valuing the arts is impossible without the concepts that make aesthetic experience available.' This view of the crucial role of specialist concepts in mediating experience was, she thought, being questioned by recent curricula developments in the schools. Within the social sciences one was forced repeatedly to see as problematic not only the value of the sociological perspective, but also the question of whether the concepts of sociology make a useful contribution to students' everyday knowledge. Students might question for instance what academic knowledge could contribute to their existing understandinf of family or youth culture, and it was only through making this link that learning could be said to have taken place (a point reinforced later by Mrs Whitehead). Unfortunately, under existing conditions of specialized 'closed' subject teaching, students too often ceased to see academic learning as being in any way related to their total selves or their personal experiences; cognitive and affective learning became split off from one another, and the relating of the two was seen as inappropriate in the classroom. It was our business to break down these barriers when we embarked on integrated curricula.

A final consideration for the dialogue between theory and practice related to the organizational setting in which integration occurred. Changes occurred here at various levels and at different times and we were not yet in a position to predict with any accuracy what would occur or when. What we did know was that there was much to be discussed when any change in educational procedures took place and organizations must allow for this discussion.

---

* M. Wax, 'Myth and interrelationship in social science: illustrated through anthropology and sociology' in Interdisciplinary Relationships in the Social Sciences, ed. M. Sherif and C.W. Sherif (Aldine, 1969).

This outline of problems to be considered did not contain any prescription about how they should be tackled. It was not enough to say we needed research, or the development of integrated schemes to research upon; we did need these things, but more than these we needed to change our own attitudes, to become much more flexible in our thinking. But this demand for increased flexibility was in danger of becoming one of our educational cliches, something which we all agreed with, but did not know how to bring about. One of the necessary conditions for achieving it was to change our whole notion of teacher education. It was significant that we still referred to the 'training of teachers', thus setting up false expectations among students that they would go through some set of processes, which would in one year turn the graduate into the teacher, and in three years those students with lesser qualifications. We followed this absurdity through with 'in-service training', which was presumably to cope with the vast array of changes which any teacher would face in his lifetime. We did not, however, make this mandatory, and for many training stopeed at the initial level. Fortunately, however, for others professional socialization went on beyond this point. Mrs Jones suggested that we put on blinkers by the 'uncritical adoption of the term "training" when our inquiries should focus on how we become teachers, and what sort of teachers we do become.'

She then moved on to the second theme of her talk; an interpretation of our work at the Institute at initial level:

> In attempting to move to more practical concerns and examine work in the social science method department of the London Institute, I found myself faced with an impossible task. We learn as we teach, and analysing and communicating the results of our learning is a solitary, and unnerving task. May I make clear at the outset that this means that the statement I shall make is personal, incomplete, and liable to change. It arises from a teaching situation which is not integrated as we work within a framework of specialist subject departments. The growth and emphases of our course have reflected outside developments, and the rapid expansion of examination work in sociology in schools and colleges had led to an emphasis on the teaching of sociology at the expense of more broadly based social studies courses. This does not, however, adequately reflect our present and developing interests, and neither does it imply a total emphasis in this direction. One of the questions I want to consider now is the weight given to different approaches within the course.

Mrs Jones then isolated several main strands in the work which she considered relevant to the discussion:

> A statement by Richard H. Brown in the American journal Change in an article entitled 'Notes on teacher education',* will I think point to the difficulties in trying to analyse the situation:
>
> 'Learning proceeds essentially from an act of the individual learner, whether it takes place in the context of a classroom or outside; that it takes place at different rates and times for each individual and can be expressed only in terms of his own change as a human being; and that it results from some form of inquiry which begins where the individual learner is and grows out of his desire to know

* Vol.2, 1970, pp.44-7.

something, as well as his feeling that he is free to learn. A corollary to this conviction is that the chief aim of education is not the transmission of an abstract body of knowledge, but the growth of individual learners as they confront new experiences, including knowledge, and in turn transform those experiences.'

Let me begin with the recruitment of students to the course.

We have moved increasingly to demand from recruits a common core of sociology, unlike our earlier recruitment, which consisted of those with a very mixed academic parentage. Within the broad category of the social sciences, however, along with this core it is now becoming possible to favour more unusual combinations, e.g. sociology and science, sociology and literature, and the variety of such combinations which occur should enable us not to take for granted certain forms of integration at the expense of others. I think it is important here to seek to include students for whom ready-made slots in terms of school subjects to teach do not exist. This is probably very important, too, for recruitment to schools and colleges. If we do not, there is the danger of losing the advantages which can come from square pegs in round holes, e.g. the perspectives which an anthropologist can bring to a school, even if he does not teach anthropology. The fact that we can recruit some students who have experience of integrated work, or at least of parallel but diverse courses, also allows for the group to look at the advantages of integration by the one teacher, or in the coming together of a number of teachers.

Mrs Jones' second point concerned the definition of the learning situation and what we all contributed to it. By this she meant the attributes, characteristics and interests that we encourage the students to make available within the group. One could make evident to the students in all sorts of ways that their methods of work and what could be worked upon were not pre-defined. Students might arrive with very narrow definitions of acceptable knowledge and learning procedures, conditioned by university experience which stressed that sociology had no concern with personal experience. A central task was to break down these earlier definitions and work towards an open questioning stance making students capable of innovation.

This was by no means straightforward for everyone was not willing at one time, or even at any time, to participate in this way. But we were committed to the attempt unless we merely wished to emphasize our students' academic identity and concentrate on producing teachers of particular subjects. Given the pressing changes in education, this was probably neither viable nor desirable, and so we were involved instead in the essential transformation of the physics or the sociology graduate into the teacher; the point being that he should define himself first as a teacher in relation to his pupils, and see his subject merely as a convenient perspective from which to begin.

A third point, directly related to the one above, lay in the definition by the students of important problems to be tackled during the course. These became a key organizing factor in the year's work.

The prior education of students had frequently led to a belief - unfortunately often not articulated - that worthy problems to be tackled lay only within one's discipline, and their solution lay in post-graduate or post-doctoral work. Another belief was in the irrelevance of theory to practice - all too frequently confirmed in

the present set-up for educating teachers. Either or both of these ideas worked against the students recognizing that such beliefs were themselves arbitrary and only by discarding them could further progress be made. Basil Bernstein, writing about the style of our educational institutions, had commented 'only the few experience in their bones the notion that knowledge is permeable, that its orderings are provisional, that the dialectic of knowledge is closure and openness.'

So we had to move towards an awareness of the complexity of the problems which faced us as teachers, allowing for the adoption of different problems by different students, and making available various possible solutions. But more important, enabling the students to realize themselves capable of considering a variety of solutions, preferably without the depressing finality of work handed in, marked, returned and forgotten.

Mrs Jones went on to show that such solutions involved many activities which brought students into contact with relevant people from the educational world, e.g. teachers in classrooms, teachers planning curricula, examiners and exmining boards, curriculum developers, with new developments, and so on. This enabled them to realize that the work of a teacher was not just an intellectural matter but was inevitably tied up with personal relationships, and also to evaluate the contribution such people could make to the educational problems the students were concerned with. Such an attempt involved a search for the grounds of evaluation, and an ability to make them explicit with reference to the problem at hand.

So, for example, with reference to a particular problem of social studies and the raising of the school leaving age, the statements of a professor may be helpful or unhelpful, the head of a department on teaching practice may be judged on the right or the wrong track, the latest curriculum development may be seen as fulfilling its promise, or it may not. One needs a social climate here in which judgements, one's own and the students', are always seen as open to modification, and dogmatic statements prefaced by 'Professor X says', or 'the facts prove that' become impossible.

Howard Becker, in one of his studies of professional commitment, made a relevant point. 'By applying the norms and categories current in the group in which they participate - they learn - who they are and how they ought to behave, acquire a self and a set of perspectives they use to shape their conduct.' The process was a slow and patchy one about which we understood little. It sometimes produced situations in which no one seemed to be learning anything and all ideas went underground for a while. But it was probably essential to the acquisition of the ability to evaluate oneself, and as the group's preoccupations changed so did the members' self-perceptions.

Mrs Jones finished this part of her talk by showing how the tasks and processes described above contributed to the construction of the student's self image, which she felt to be a central component of the process of becoming a teacher. Bound up as it was with self-evaluation, it emphasized the importance of the students' adoption of a professional identity. For the majority it involved trying things out for themselves, and suggested a variety of activities in which students might be involved. Richard Brown, in the previously cited article, gave a pointer when he said, 'We need to afford teachers new kinds of experiences that challenge them to reflect

analytically and intuitively on how they themselves learn, perceiving the relationship of learning to their total experience, to everything they do, and to everyone with whom they come into significant contact.' In the final section of her talk she tied her interpretation of the process of educating teachers back into the topic of integration:

> As I said in the first part of the paper, I believe that shifts to integration involve fundamental personal changes and adjustments. The educational situation is undoubtedly changing - what is significant is the location of the change. We have sponsored projects, for example, by the Schools Council. We have new institutions - for example, the Open University. We have developments within existing institutions (Thomas Bennett, Loughton). Given this situation, the question of who contributes to teacher education becomes much more open to discussion and experiment. Perhaps in our own discussion we should look very seriously at what institutions might be involved - schools, colleges, institutions, bodies like the Schools Council, professional associations, teachers' centres, etc.
>
> More important, we should look at the sorts of relationships they stand in to each other, as well as the part they can play in our education as teachers. The accomplishment of changed relationships seems to me to be crucial. The old, traditional hierarchical authority relationships will have to go, and this involves change in the individual consciousness. These changes have started, but old assumptions too frequently remain. The continued existence of the traditional relationship of theory to practice stands as testimony to this.

It seemed to me that the valuable contribution of this talk to the subject of integrated curricula lay in its emphasis on the learning process in teacher education as an open, fluid, changing one in which students did not so much assimilate a new body of knowledge or 'tips' for teachers, but were encouraged to reformulate their notions of what learning, teaching and their discipline involved and how they related to everyday experience. This was a highly complex individual process depending on social interaction of many kinds and leading towards a transformation of role from student to teacher, and the shaping of a particular kind of professional identity. Its essence lay in the breaking down of previously accepted categories, and the questioning of old assumptions. These are essentially the processes involved in establishing integrated curricula in schools and new ways of learning for pupils. Teachers whose training has been an experience of this should be well placed to initiate changes in schools. The relevance of this comment will I think become clear in the talks which follow, which exemplify in practice many of the questions Mrs Jones raised at a theoretical level, and also offer interesting parallels between the learning situation of intending teachers and that of younger students.

Integrated courses at Loughton College of Further Education

The courses described by Joan Whitehead and Margaret Shepherd were an A-level course bringing together sociology and English literature, and leading to separate A-level examinations in each of these: and an O-level course leading to five examinations in English language and literature, sociology, history, and general studies - all except English literature being examined on a Mode III basis. Although some of the problems and issues the speakers raised were explicit to one or other of these courses, many of the points about teacher-pupil reactions, organizational considerations and assessments have wider significance. As it happened Joan Whitehead described the A-level course and

Margaret Shepherd the O-level one, though she had also taught on the A-level one. In this report I have brought together their two contributions under the following headings: 1. the context and rationale for the change to integrated courses; 2. the organization and teaching methods on the new courses; 3. an evaluation of their effects on students and teachers.

1. The context and rationale for the change to integrated courses

Joan Whitehead started by describing the context and rationale for changing to integrated courses.

> In examining the curriculum changes which have occured at Loughton, it is important to note that they are confined to the Department of General Studies and that the views we shall be expressing are our own, and shared by some, but not the whole department. I say this at the outset to give an indication of the unfeasibility of proposing that fundamental changes will be received and accepted by a large number of staff simultaneously. Such a proposition would ignore the time-scale involved in the assimilation and acceptance of new ideas, it would ignore the necessity to prove and evaluate the worth of changes before a total department is prepared to commit itself, and it would ignore the very real threat that such ideas constitute to certain entrenched interests. Integration on the mature O-level course has been operating for two years, on other O-level courses for one year, whilst at A-level the first year of a two-year course has just ended. Hence we feel a degree of uneasiness at being here it is premature to assess objectively our success, apart from noting superficially that other members of the department have been influenced and encouraged to participate in similar schemes, that the enrolment for students on next year's integrated, as opposed to subject specialist, A-level course has doubled; we shall be considering the general problem of more rigorous evaluation during our talks. We are also fully aware of the lack of conventionality we present in our choice of subjects at A-level; disciplines which are categorized as totally distinctive forms of knowledge are at one level converging in our curriculum. Perhaps at this point I could refer you to our introductory sheet (Appendix D) in which we attempt to define how we are using the concept of integration.
>
> We feel that teaching methods which emphasize only the purity of subjects, and teaching methods which deny the differentiation of knowledge into different subjects are equally limiting in offering students a means to understanding the world. Therefore we believe it important for students to retain the consciousness of a discipline, its central concerns and its appropriate methods of inquiry.
>
> Professor Hirst raises the point in his article 'Logical and psychological aspects of teaching'* whether or not pupils' interest is not more easily aroused and learning more effective when we structure what we teach in such second-order organizations of knowledge, e.g. childhood, the neighbourhood, etc. rather than teaching distinctly logical and cohesive disciplines. I believe we

* In R. Peters (ed.), The Concept of Education (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1967).

are ploughing a middle furrow in our approach at A level. In no way is there a total fusion between the disciplines, in which both lose their independent identity. They are seen to be instrinsically worthwhile at one level, and at another are used as tools in problem solving.

As has been stated by Jean Jones, the division of knowledge into subject areas is arbitrary and subject to change. There seems consequently a strong point in favour of helping students to discover how to learn, rather than merely imparting particular content tied to particular disciplines whose boundaries will be quite different in the future. Besides, the content of knowledge is changing so rapidly, particularly in the social sciences, that the wastage through obsolescence can be avoided by this emphasis on the learning process.

This next section of the talk describes how the new courses were developed and brings out clearly the interrelation of philosophical and pragmatic considerations discussed by Mrs Jones. The organizational context of change and the professional identities of teachers were found to be of critical importance.

From this it doubtless gives the impression that our philosophical position was well established prior to initiating the changes. This would certainly be untrue. The decision to move in the direction of integration was a much more pragmatic one: we held certain intuitive beliefs, and I think during our implementation have attempted to clarify them and put them on a firmer footing.

In terms of practical implementation, we found as members of a complex hierarchical college one could only innovate in so far as the administration allowed. This is true generally. If the principal and departmental head are uncommitted to change, then it is most unlikely that innovation will occur. We were very fortunate then in having a head of department providing impetus and encouragement for this development, allowing us autonomy, and fighting for the resources and timetabling arrangements we needed to support the schemes, the first of which he himself taught on.* Timetabling arrangements and the selection of a course team sharing a similar outlook, are vital to the process. Perhaps I should add that other institutions might equally well provide the necessary conditions for curriculum innovation but not all teachers have either enough commitment or can devote sufficient time and energy to what is involved. It seems that innovation is dependent on the willingness of staff at all levels of the institution, and possibly progress could be accelerated if relief from some student-contact hours were granted to them during planning operations. The absence of this kind of encouragement may impede the development of Mode III exams by some organizations, and I feel it is a genuine problem for staff at Loughton trying to operate Mode IIIs and being concerned to implement and evaluate new courses around them.

---

* We feel we should acknowledge our debt here to Mr Michael Read who was head of the department of general studies at Loughton from the foundation of the college until his sudden death at the end of 1970. He was to have been a member of the conference.

To give a clearer understanding of the actual establishment of our courses, it is necessary for me to describe something of the social structure of the college. No doubt this will also illuminate some of my earlier comments about the selection of English and sociology as areas of integration at A level.

Firstly, the original allocation of subjects to departments has had a predetermining effect on subsequent innovation. Whereas in some colleges, economics, British constitution, law, statistics are assigned along with sociology, this did not happen at Loughton. These subjects were allocated along with secretarial courses to the business studies department, whilst sociology, social economics, English, history, modern languages, liberal and elective studies were the domain of the general studies department. It appears to be a common factor in most institutions, even those which strongly advocate the concept of the open society, that departments are fervently insular, objectives are discussed within rather than between departments, and in defence of a position I adhere to rather than believe in, I can only justify it on grounds of sheer expediency. Given that educational organizations function with departmental structures, access to one's own staff is easier through informal and formal department meetings than it is to other departments' staff.

Secondly, the general studies and business studies departments pursued slightly different staffing policies. This meant that staff were likely to identify and develop areas of interest more closely within their own department. In general studies staff were recruited not only on the basis of their subject specialism, but also with regard to their potential contribution to liberal studies programmes, and to their suitability as personal tutors to students.

Several generations of the staff had spent their postgraduate year at the London Institute of Education.

I want to emphasize the tremendous value of this link with the Institute. Students are placed annually with us on teaching practice and this makes us reconsider the way in which we are operating as we need to justify it to others.

The business studies department functioned at that time around a more formal definition of teaching. This is important since the introduction of our integrated courses was accompanied by a decrease in social distance between tutors and students. This raises the question of whether school sixth forms could undertake experiments, which in many cases threaten the established order, as easily as further education colleges. It also raises the issue as to whether or not certain personality types amongst the teaching profession can operate in this new context, and whether existing teachers can be helped to modify their approach.

There were other reasons besides departmental structure for the inclusion of particular subjects in the scheme. It turned out that the English and sociology teachers were already in many cases using the same course materials for different purposes so it seemed sensible they should rationalize their collection and use. Also general studies was included in this O-level course as Miss Shepherd explained, because the form of examination offered possibilities for the sort of work the planners had in mind. It included a project (a study in some depth) which could be inter-disciplinary, and an examination paper with three sections, social/political, scientific and aesthetic, within which questions were broadly based: for example, a question on poetry might require a student to discuss its significance in relation to war.

Having established that integration was to be an internal departmental policy, the decision and the timing needed to be considered. On reflection the decision seemed to be prompted by several factors. Some staff were becoming concerned at the lack of cohesion, and disjointedness of students' courses - particularly one-year courses. These were situations in which bodies of knowledge were being 'covered' for exams, and tutors were often unable to stress that the subjects were ways of inquiring into reality. It appeared that knowledge was to exist independently of the knower.

The first course to be critically reassessed was the one-year O-level course for mature students which, as Margaret Shepherd described, posed particular problems. The O-level students showed little commitment and were subject to very intensive but fragmented timetables. A further important consideration was the extent to which they felt isolated; in further education there is no stable form unit or common assembly of the kind which may produce a sense of identity in schools. It was hoped that the establishment of an integrated course might help to overcome some of these difficulties. Its actual implementation, however, was not so simple; it depended, as Mrs Whitehead pointed out, on both the degree of teacher commitment and on organizational changes.

There were at this stage differing views in the department on such subjects as the rationale behind the ordering of teaching resources and the staffing structure of the department. As a preliminary organizational change all tutors were given course rather than subject responsibilities - for example, one teacher might be a course co-ordinator for a particular group of students. This change was disturbing for some teachers. It was, however, a strategic move in encouraging staff to look outside their particular discipline to its wider contribution to the course. Once these units were established, it became obvious to several staff that an integrated course could be more meaningful to our students, and that Mode III exams would be a preferable method of examining. It must seem to an outsider a game of political engineering, but I think illustrates the factors which anybody keen to innovate a policy of integration must consider.

2. The organization and teaching methods of the new courses

Miss Shepherd described how they had deliberately planned the work in an 'untidy scheme with much opportunity for disintegration and spontaneous divergence' to prevent the premature 'closure' of what should remain 'open' problems. There were two main sorts of teaching situations:

(i) Parallel, in which loosely unified topics like 'childhood' or 'war' were chosen and relevant aspects covered by the subject specialists.

(ii) A block time in which the different teachers involved were together explicitly linking different aspects of a certain topic, e.g. 'Ireland in the 1920s' was studied through an historical and sociological analysis and a scene from an O'Casey play.

Mrs Whitehead explained that the A-level course was still developing: both teachers were deeply involved in the learning process themselves through the material they were presenting, the method of presentation and the students' responses to both of these.

The group was composed of nineteen students, all wanting to teach, aged 16 to 21, and ranging in achievement from a student with one O level to a

student with nine O levels. They were operating within the bounds of the A-level Economics and Sociology AEB syllabuses and therefore any stringent alteration in sources and content could only come as those changed. However, within the syllabuses a few areas had been dealt with in depth rather than many areas superficially. She strongly advocated curtailing syllabuses, or having them so broad that teachers could easily be selective within them; this was in keeping with her earlier emphasis, and that of Mrs Jones on the learning process rather than on content.

> Moving on to a consideration of our teaching method, I think our enthusiasm in wanting to prove the course successful was transmitted to the students. We were faced by a situation immediately of having to explain to students what 21 hours on their timetables labelled 'Integrated Studies' meant. Possibly this element of trust which was established between us early in the course, together with the relaxed atmosphere we attempted to create, was fundamental to our approach. The students had made a tape of their reactions to the course and I felt we had achieved a lot when one of them stated that the situation made them feel their 'natural selves', that the element of competition felt at school was removed. They felt we were all exploring together, but that the tutors were there to help them make relationships between their studies, and relate their studies to their experience.
>
> I feel that significant learning takes place only when subject matter is perceived by the students as having relevance for their own purposes. This influenced how we presented our materials, using visits and films whenever possible, involving them in direct experimental confrontation. Surely this is what education is about - to give students the tools from our diverse disciplines to help them formulate their conceptions of the world and involve them in the process itself.

During this section of her talk Mrs Whitehead diverted from her plan in order to give some examples of ways in which links between the subjects had been made and I shall refer to some of these in my later commentary. Finally she and Mrs Shepherd attempted to assess the new courses, both in terms of cognitive learning, effects on pupil-teacher relationships, and on the teachers themselves.

2. An evaluation of the effects of the new courses on students and teachers

> This is obviously difficult at such an early stage. I want to attempt to cover it in two ways - how Margaret and I perceived the course, and how the students reacted. It is only by feedback from both sources that we can critically assess in order to modify. The most obvious method is evaluation through examination but as the students have not yet taken A level we are unable to judge. Their O-level, Mode III results are our only indication, and these seem very sound. I would like to refer to John Hipkin's article 'Examinations: a strategy for the seventies' in the spring 1970 issue of the NUT's Secondary Education, in which he says:
>
> > When it comes to examining, the inquiry teacher often finds it difficult or impossible to predetermine detailed learning objectives towards which he is expected to lead his pupils. He will want to develop criteria of assessment which are more

What is Biafra?
I imagine it dry, desolate,
A dusty yellow colour
Strewn with black bushes
Yellow mud huts
Thin, skeletal, pot-bellied children
Black, the dead ones black with flies
The live ones staring dull-eyed at the ground
Or the cameras
Particularly the cameras
I imagine the occasional lorry in a dust cloud
Filled with soldiers in dirty khaki with rifles
Or filled with dead bodies
The soldiers are not starving
The women and children are
Past caring; past living, past dying
Existing in the listlessness of total exhaustion
I don't care about it.
If they have a civil war what do they expect?
War is uncivil anyway
Perhaps I should care but I don't

What is Biafra?
The eternal refuse of emergency supplies
The ultimate in frustrated charity
Why Biafra?
I don't know
How many Biafrans are there? How many are starving?
How many are fighting?
I don't know
All I know is that there are children
Sitting vacantly on the yellow ground
With swollen bellies and skin-covered bones.

Robert Milne

In English, a subject concerned with the individual's response to his environment, necessarily a passionate setting, questions are thrown up which would be more appropriately defined, clarified or answered by the social scientist. Frequently the isolated English teacher, when teaching through a controversial topic, is tempted to make naive social generalizations.

When teachers from different disciplines work together with a group of students, it is more likely that the teachers will identify the deepest concerns of the students, the biggest gaps in their knowledge, and their major learning difficulties. Then they can better help feed the students' curiosity and solve some of their problems.

As far as English work was concerned some good writing had come out of the course. Discussion had become freer and more exciting and 'students were less inhibited about what was appropriate, but perhaps more concerned about what was relevant.' A final justification (very important to the students) was that the examination pass rate had improved, 'which could have been because interest and curiosity in one subject stimulated interest in related areas in other subjects.'

contingent and flexible, and in this task he will depend very largely upon the developing competence of colleagues engaged in similar teaching. Examiners, subject panels, and moderators will have to make allowances for these problems, and provide arrangements which will effect compromises between the often conflicting claims for objective assessment and individual teaching aims which may not be definitive or exact.

I feel that this expresses my own frustrations in relation to A level, that the present means of examining is not one that encourages inquiry method, and I can only hope that next year our students can adapt their knowledge to what is demanded from more conventional examinations. Integration did not solve all teaching problems. One still found students skipping classes if they found a topic difficult, and possibly the approach demanded more or maybe different things from them.

It certainly appeared to give scope to the active students, those who were productive on their own, and had a wide range of interests; they flourished as the premium was on creativity rather than memorization. Perhaps the most obvious benefits were social. One could see the group initially unknown to one another, of varying ages, social backgrounds, and abilities, gaining security together, gaining confidence to express themselves, and showing a strong group sentiment. This is certainly different from most other further education courses where isolation and not co-operation is often the norm.

The students' evaluations are similar. From the tape-recording one can hear the activists describing their social development together, and I feel they demonstrate their assimilation of much of the academic content. It is not just an understanding of specific facts but of their relationship in an explanation of social processes. They demonstrate this orally but I'm afraid some are unable to structure their thoughts well in written form at this stage.

Mrs Whitehead thought that ultimately one had to face the fact that even when the relationships between teachers and students were good, courses were made as interesting and varied as possible, and students could plan their own work, there were still some who did not want to learn. This was a problem with or without integration but it seemed from their experience that it was rather less of a problem given integration.

Margaret Shepherd felt that problems for the students had arisen in two ways - first, because of lack of time the teachers had not become sufficiently familiar with each other's material, so links were not always explicitly made; second, the teachers had found themselves too self-conscious to be explicit to the students about their aims, which probably caused confusion. In spite of this she felt that there had been benefits for the students in the new approach. The teachers felt that through joint consultation they had a better understanding of individual student's problems, and students accepted the new learning situation more, and participated more in extra-curricular and out of college supportive activities. She also felt the students had enlarged their understanding of the different subjects involved.

Miss Shepherd then read this poem written by one of her students:

Miss Shepherd also discussed some of the effects on the teachers, resulting from the process of setting up integrated studies:

> Two and a half years ago we started what seemed interminable and unresolvable discussions. The process rather than beginning to blur the lines between particular subjects, sharpened the teacher's awareness of the uniqueness of his own subject. We began desperately to justify and clarify our aims. We also tended to lose our prejudices and illusions about other subjects. English teachers had feared that the freshness of their students' writing would be corrupted by sociological jargon. Sociologists had feared that English lessons were an excuse for emotional indulgence. Through discussion we became less suspicious of each other, and an enthusiasm and commitment to the new course was generated. This is why I hope that any intended social studies project will leave room for teachers to join in the planning stages and thereby identify more with the content of the courses.
>
> We came into conflict with the problem of subject 'purity' but we came to realize that some subjects were demonstrably 'impure' anyway. English is taught sometimes as social studies, sometimes as linguistics, and even as religion. We also discovered that what we regarded as special about our subject was not necessarily tested at O level anyway, and this is why the process went hand in hand with our introducing a new type of GCE evaluation.
>
> In a wider sense, integrated studies threatens the ego of the teacher. There are many myths about the magical qualities of the born teacher. The power, the rewards, the exam passes are attributable to his magnetic personality; just as lack of control, examination failures, even physical assault are attributable to his weakness. Thus in most institutions teaching problems are not considered as common to all, or as having concrete, or material solutions. Integration can reduce the tremendous neurotic, personal responsibility of the teacher, and bring him to accept that he is answerable to his colleagues. Team teaching in this way provides a situation for positive, constructive and communal consideration of teaching problems.

Miss Shepherd concluded with the following points; first, she reiterated the importance of the Mode III examinations in allowing freedom of planning. Second, the importance of each subject teacher being involved in the planning so that central areas of their own subject were not sacrificed to produce a neat scheme. Third, teachers had to share with the students the principles of integration they were using, and fourth, a plea again for teacher involvement in planning:

> Whatever project emerges from the conference, I hope it will be open-ended enough to allow the teachers in the schools to be involved in some planning of the course; not because the scheme is likely to be any better, but because it is the only way teachers will carry out a course with any real commitment.

The accounts seemed to me to illustrate an attitude to the learning process in the classroom parallel to Jean Jones' approach to the situation in which graduates learn to become teachers. The interest in producing a certain 'social climate' as a benefit of an integrated approach would I suppose be an indication of a choice in Lawrence Stenhouse's terms of 'integration for social purposes' rather than to provide a range of intellectual choices. I think this is a

false choice, however, and one which has bedevilled the growth of social studies in the past. As the speakers indicate it is desirable to retain a concern for both; they see social learning as going alongside the intellectual challenge of bringing together different disciplines, rather than as an alternative benefit.

It was, however, significant that the examples discussed were not ones of integration within the social sciences, so that the aim was clearly not that of giving understanding of the relationships between them. Mrs Whitehead and Miss Shepherd gave explicit reasons for the kind of integrated programme they have attempted which I think reflected one fairly strong body of opinion at the conference - that integration is a way of relating different kinds of understanding of society to one another and that an essential part of this lies in the bringing together of cognitive and affective learning.

The value of this is brought out particularly in Margaret Shepherd's account of the breaking down of barriers between English specialists and sociologists, and of the kinds of understanding revealed in the poem she quoted. It was interesting to see the benefits of integration specifically from the points of view of the English teacher, at a conference largely devoted to the preoccupations of social scientists.

In spite of this, Joan Whitehead and Margaret Shepherd were with the earlier speakers, at pains to keep the subjects involved distinct - in fact to emphasize their differences and allow flexible relations between them; sometimes coming together on a problem, sometimes running parallel, sometimes pursuing separate courses. This is made clear in the examples Joan Whitehead gives of some situations which arose in the classroom when they were teaching the topics of childhood and education.

(i) The first example was of a lesson centred around the topic of 'The Child at School'. Mrs Whitehead used the concept of role and directed discussion around teachers' and children's differing conceptions of the role of the pupil. Miss Shepherd provided poems and extracts from literature to give imaginative insight into the feelings and experiences this role evoked.

(ii) The second example placed the onus on students to relate sociological and imaginative perspectives to problem solving, e.g. students were asked, 'Imagine you are faced with a class of rowdy children. Given your recent studies, how would you cope?'

(iii) Students became able spontaneously to relate their knowledge derived from the distinct disciplines, e.g. when they visited a vertically-grouped primary school they offered comparative evidence of teaching methods from Gradgrind's school in Hard Times.

(iv) The academic content of the course was also reinforced through students' recreational pursuits both in drama and art, e.g. the students' production of a children's pantomime necessitated analysis of language and situations appropriate to the social composition of the audience.

(v) In some of the concerns of the teachers no integration existed, e.g. between the methodology of the social sciences and of literary criticism.

The talks of both Mrs Whitehead and Miss Shepherd offered detailed support to the issue raised by Mr Flower and Mrs Jones, of the intimate

relation between new courses and modes of assessment and the frustration of trying to produce a radical new syllabus within the constraints of existing examination procedures. They also illustrate graphically the point raised by Mrs Jones at a theoretical level; that a change to integrated courses reduces the individual teacher's autonomy, and forces him to justify his teaching to his colleagues. This demands nothing less than a change in his sense of professional identity, unless his training or previous experience has already opened his mind to this conception of his job.

Finally - the speakers point to one problem which was raised by Lawrence Stenhouse, for they offer a different approach to curriculum change from that possible in the situations at Thomas Bennett School and the Open University. They are essentially personal and idiosyncratic to the teachers who evolved and taught them. The question arises as to how far they could be generalized and what would be the effects on them of any attempt to transfer them to other teachers and institutional settings? Or further, how far <u>any</u> attempts to develop new curricula are transferable in their entirety as their originators conceived them?

IV. COMMENTARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Part of my brief in making my commentary on the conference was to bring together the main themes preoccupying the discussion groups. These took place on the afternoon of the first day and the morning of the second, and each had an appointed chairman and rapporteur. As has already been indicated, the groups turned out to be rather too small for optimum exchanges of views, and it was quite difficult to extract clear themes from the report on each. However, many particular points and ideas in this commentary derive from them with, I hope, due acknowledgement on my part. The groups seemed to reach a remarkable consensus about what they thought the nature of any development project should be, or (emphatically) what it should not be. Apart from this, different groups tended (in their final report at any rate) to crystallize particular views expressed at the conference.

Besides commenting on these discussions, I have tried to bring together the main themes from the first and second days' speakers; and finally to review what seem important areas on which any possible Schools Council project might concentrate. I present here a slightly amended and enlarged form of what I said, which I have tried to put to some extent into the theoretical frameworks offered by my colleagues Basil Bernstein and Michael F.D. Young (in Knowledge and Control: New Directions on the Sociology of Education).*

I find it useful to look at the subject of this conference in the context of the development of social science subjects in schools in the last seven years. When I first became involved in this field, 'social studies' consisted largely of what has been described as 'undifferentiated mush', and was confined to courses for early school leavers.† There were no GCE examination courses, except in the older established subjects such as economics and British constitution, and of course history and geography. It was clear that if the social sciences were to become recognized parts of the school curriculum they must be made 'respectable' by becoming part of the examination structure. There was a convincing claim for their inclusion from a study of the kind of themes (such as the family, poverty, gangs and delinquency) which teachers with no training in these disciplines were attempting to discuss in their social studies courses; there was also a background of increasing public interest in these fields of study, illustrated by their popularity in journals and other media.

---

* M.F.D. Young (ed.) op.cit. I should point out that I speak as a sociologist. This has led me to this particular framework and to the over-use of examples [illegible] with which I am familiar. I hope it has not led me into obscurity or [illegible] to do less than justice to the problems of other disciplines.

† Charmian Cannon, 'Social studies in secondary schools', Educational Review [illegible].

This situation in the schools is perhaps helpfully seen in terms of M.F.D. Young's theoretical framework* in which he discusses the status of different types of academic knowledge in this country and its links to the social class system, particularly in the distribution of power and property. Specialized knowledge in itself is here categorized as a form of 'property'. In these terms the social sciences, relatively new even in universities until recently, were still suspect, low status forms of knowledge; this was reflected in their position in relation to the hierarchy of knowledge in schools. High status knowledge is reserved for the oldest and ablest pupils: it is narrow in scope - that is, specialized; and closed - that is, different knowledge areas are not related to each other.† 'Social studies' was confined to younger, less able pupils, was non-specialized and 'open' - a 'ragbag' some would say. In order that the social sciences ‡ make themselves acceptable in the hierarchy of knowledge it was important that they should be seen as having the characteristics of high status knowledge. 'These are literacy, or an emphasis on written presentation; individualism (or avoidance of group work or co-operativeness) ... abstractness of the knowledge and the structuring and compartmentalization independently of the knowledge of the learner; finally ... the unrelatedness of school curricula (that is) the extent to which they are "at odds" with daily life and common experience.' §

Thus it was no accident that the first A-level sociology syllabuses and the recent A-level psychology syllabus have followed the model of earlier A-level courses. They have all the above characteristics of high status knowledge and within the context in which they were established this was probably essential to their success. But now we are in a different situation. The threats posed by the questioning of knowledge boundaries and new modes of presentation and assessment have reached the threshold of the highest level in the schools; the academic sixth form with its formal examination system and competitive higher education entrance function. Not only this, but they are penetrating higher education, as we saw in Michael Drake's account, and as is also clear from the organization of other social studies courses in new universities and polytechnics.

It would be interesting to speculate on the reasons for this rapid development. Are they related to changes in the wider social structure and particularly to the erosion of traditional power relations? ‖ There is no time to pursue these questions, but I think it significant that those of us interested in school social sciences are now secure enough to sit down and thrash out some of the issues involved in integrated work at sixth-form level, even though we have little previous experience to draw on. It is also interesting to ask why enough people saw this as an urgent issue to allow this conference to be called together. Many of those involved are themselves possessors of property in their specialized knowledge of one or other of the social sciences. Is it that they fear that the present beating on the sixth-form door of more and more individual social science syllabuses will result in the rejection of them all by bewildered

---

* M.F.D. Young, 'Curricula as Socially Organised Knowledge' in Young (ed.) op. cit.

† ibid., pp.33-4.

‡ I refer to the social sciences here in terms of sociology, social anthropology and social psychology. This is not to be exclusive but to differentiate them from the very different position of economics and other older established disciplines.

§ M.F.D. Young (ed.) op.cit., p.32.

‖ See Basil Bernstein's discussion of this in Young (ed.) op. cit., p.67.

heads of schools? Or is it, as I prefer to think, a genuine concern for all sixth-formers, and their preparation for life in a society in which the insights of the social sciences are increasingly relevant? Within this context, there seem to be four main questions asked of the conference:

(1) What is meant by 'integration'? Should it be promoted, and if so on what principles?

(2) What should be integrated?

(3) What are the implications of integration - for institutions, teachers and pupils?

(4) Given the answers to these questions what needs to be done by the Schools Council or anybody else?

1. What is meant by integration? Are we in favour of it, and if so on what principles?

Curiously, only one speaker as far as I remember, raised the first question explicitly - Mr Flower - when he questioned whether the establishment of an A-level social science might be merely a new form of 'collection' curriculum in which disciplines run parallel but never meet, thus posing no threat to the existing order, and presenting few possibilities of exciting exploratory work. The question is also raised in one of the examples appended to Mr Flower's paper, that by Ian McWhinnie (Appendix C). After describing a 'joint study' of history and literature on a common theme, he says:

> Is it correct to say that specialist subject teachers cause students ... to think in the narrow terms of that particular discipline? This, although proper in part, works against the idea of integration which I take to be the aim of giving students a more comprehensive understanding ... In other words is an integrated study more than the sum of its specialist subject parts?

He goes on to say that he thinks it needs a built-in component such as a project, which will act as a centripetal force to overcome the centrifugal forces of the separate subjects. This is certainly one view of what distinguishes 'integration'. Bernstein defines integration minimally as 'the subordination of previously insulated subjects or courses to some relational idea, which blurs the boundaries between the subjects'.* It is clear from all the examples offered by participants in the conference that none of them conceive of integration in the form of the disappearance of such boundaries. Rather in their accounts there is a constantly changing relationship between the subjects involved. They run parallel; diverge; or focus on some common problems or ideas. There is strain felt in many cases between what the teachers see as the logic and integrity of their subject, and their conscious aim to use it as a vehicle for illuminating some broader question. This of course is partly the result of teachers educated in a specialist tradition trying to redefine their own professional identities.

In this sense, most (though not all) of the participants accepted the notion of integrated courses for both practical and epistemological reasons. But in general there was no desire to rush in headlong. Integrated social science was seen as an alternative to existing single-subject courses; there was a general plea to keep a situation of flexibility and of options in any examination scheme and to safeguard study in depth as one part of such a scheme, in order to avoid superficiality. In relation to these ideas, one

---

* Bernstein, in Young (ed.) op. cit., p.53.

discussion group (group K) put forward a modest and workable suggestion for introducing a section into existing single-discipline A levels, which at first allowed, and later compelled, the candidates to consider interdisciplinary implications.

The discussion groups also accepted that any integrated course should recognize the distinctive contributions of the disciplines involved, and that there should be some organizing principles or unifying idea. Again though, there was a feeling that options should be kept open, that valid courses could be organized round concepts and methodology or themes, or problems, or under some broad over-arching idea such as the 'Understanding Society' of the Open University. The urge to explore all these possibilities is perhaps best shown in group C's examples of course units based on alternative theoretical models, which are reproduced in Appendix E.

It is only fair to add that there were a few attending the conference who were by no means convinced that any case for integration had been made, and who in the closing forum expressed dissatisfaction with the fact that time had not been spent on the case against it. Others, though theoretically in favour, were less than convinced that this was the time to launch a project on it in face of other priorities - a point I shall return to later.

2. What should be integrated?

Again there was no wish to close this question. As I have said, there was considerable support for using sociology, social psychology and social anthropology as a viable 'core', on the basis that they shared enough basic concepts and methods to make some coherence possible. Economics and politics, history and geography held claims to places in a scheme, as, for a few, did archaeology and law. Such subjects can all be considered as part of the social sciences but, as has been indicated previously, many groups and speakers found it difficult to keep within the bounds urged on them by Lawrence Stenhouse and the conference chairman and consider only the relations between social science subjects. Some found no problems here; others obediently tried (group C); a sizeable group (strongly expressed by group D) would not accept the brief because they saw the main benefits in integration lying within the contrasting approaches of the subjects chosen. This is illustrated by the contributions from Loughton College. I find it a point worth exploring, as to why so many examples of already existing courses do run across into the humanities and literature. It would seem equally valid, given the 'mid-way' position of the social disciplines between the sciences and the arts, that courses bringing together sociology and biology or other natural sciences should have been tried. Does their absence reflect something about the nature of the subjects as at present conceived; something about the 'organizational' categories in which they exist in institutions (i.e. faculties, departments and the like) or something about the professional identities of innovators as related to their conception of their subject? There were some, for example in group B, who were ready to consider an integrated social science course as a springboard for later co-ordination with other subjects such as literature. There were also those who would admit the use of literature as a special kind of evidence within a social science course which is a limited exercise not going beyond the original brief.

There are, of course, deeper problems underlying these differences, which have been indicated by Philip Abrams:

> At present the social sciences are either not sciences or not social. Uncertainty prevails ...

by Peter Mitchell:

> Important consideration will have to be given to the question of excluding incompatible approaches within the social sciences...

and by group D:

> The point was made ... the social sciences were themselves moving away from a scientific stance and in sociology particularly [new] perspectives were closer to imaginative exercises than many social scientists would care to admit.

Group C also expressed misgivings about the 'method-based' course of Thomas Bennett, in case it should discourage students from the 'imaginative leap and from speculative thinking'. There are thus differences of view about the kind of understanding promoted by the social disciplines and certainly there is a 'wind of change' blowing through the teaching at least of sociology in universities in this country.* It is possible that, as Peter Mitchell indicated, differences of approach might be discussed in a course based on inquiry methods but the demands this would make on the teachers and students should not be overestimated. Psychologists tend to fall into two non-communicating groups of psychoanalysts and behaviourists and sociologists are no better at agreeing.† One could argue that one can only teach convincingly from one's own stance, and all students must get a partial view; also that to present them with anything else is to lead them into confusion before they have achieved a basic social literacy. On the other hand, a commitment to integration is a commitment to 'open-ness'; so is a commitment to 'inquiry method' for true inquiry once started is not easily contained. The practical question one is left asking is: If there is so much flux and uncertainty within any one of the social disciplines, what happens when you attempt to integrate them? If such integration is to do justice to their 'logic and nature', one must know what that logic and nature is! Or perhaps it is only possible to proceed pragmatically, which will result in as many integrated courses as there are groups of teachers working on them. If this is the case it has implications for the type of project which might be launched which are worth pursuing further. But first let us turn to what we have learned from the conference about some of the implications of curriculum change; implications any project should take careful note of.

3. The implications of integration ♦

It is perhaps useful to look at the situations in which our examples of integration were generated. On the one hand they were in relatively new situations like the Open University in which planning from scratch was possible, and staffing and finance forthcoming. On the other hand they were in on-going situations in which only small-scale experiments were possible, depending on discussions between like-minded teachers, working in close contact with each other, as in the further education colleges. In these cases, too, support from the hierarchy was found indispensible: but it is interesting to note the conditions in further education which,

---

* Shown in the recent publication in England of Jack Douglas's Understanding Everyday Life (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971).

† See Alan Dawe, 'The two sociologies', British Journal of Sociology, Vol.XXI, No.2, 1970.

♦ Many of the implications involved in this section and brought out by speaker are discussed at a theoretical level by Bernstein in his article already cited. See Young (ed.) op. cit., pp.63-6.

as Mr Flower pointed out, make integration at this level of work more likely. There are possibilities of flexibility and response to student need which have led already to the vast majority of A-level social sciences being developed in further education rather than schools. They also have, for this reason and others, specialist teachers in the social sciences. This is a most important asset, for one basic question which I think was underplayed in the conference was the question raised in the paper on aims and issues: who is to teach it?

This problem cannot be dismissed as readily as it is by Professor Abrams when he says that both integrated social science courses in universities and team teaching in schools are on the increase. Schools are lucky if they have any social scientist on the staff apart from a historian and a geographer and they are unlikely to have a sociologist, social psychologist or anthropologist. This situation is changing; more social scientists are coming into teaching and more courses are developing to prepare them (though I would suggest the problems of this preparation are rarely thought through in the way they have been by Jean Jones). The supply of B.Ed. graduates with social science qualifications will increase, though slowly: but one must assume that for some years to come, it will be rare to find more than one teacher qualified in the newer social sciences in a school, except in very large schools like Thomas Bennett. We should note that all the schemes described to us involved more than one teacher. Must one assume then that 'one-teacher' integration is not feasible? Accounts of the social interaction necessary to generate a course would suggest that the single teacher would suffer grave disadvantages in such an enterprise even if he had the breadth of expertise necessary. So we are faced with a situation in which non-social scientists must be helped to take on social science perspectives and isolated teachers given support. This argues a case for 'maximum teacher education' involving, as Jean Jones indicated, the broadest view of this both in the time-scale involved, and the institutions which have a role to play. As she also suggests, such a re-education involves a re-education in social relationships. As Professor Bernstein puts it, teaching integrated curricula calls for 'much greater powers of synthesis and analogy, and far more ability both to tolerate and enjoy ambiguity at the level of knowledge and social relationships'.*

(a) Social implications for teacher-pupil relationships

The conference seemed united in the view that if an integrated course was to be followed it should be presented through an inquiry method. Although 'guided inquiry' on the Thomas Bennett pattern sets boundaries on the topics chosen and questions that may be asked, nevertheless such a method should involve the blurring or redrawing of boundaries. Once questioning becomes open, where does it stop? Probably the pupil is given more autonomy, more control over his subject-matter and he participates more actively. Authority relations between teacher and taught may be changed, and co-operation between teachers and between pupils may tend to replace individual and private work. The speakers from Loughton pointed out the benefits to teachers and pupils from this and, in particular, Margaret Shepherd described the increase in security among her students. This I found interesting as I would have expected that changes of methods and increased openness would produce increased insecurity in the students. Perhaps their reactions have more to do with their previous experiences of what is acceptable classroom learning and their relations with their teacher than with any changes in the curriculum?

---

* B. Bernstein, 'Classification and framing of educational knowledge', in Young (ed.), op. cit., p.65.

(b) Social implications for teachers

Enough has been said by the speakers to substantiate the statement made by Young* that moves to give equal value to different kinds of knowledge, or to establish different criteria of evaluation because they pose a threat to the power structure will be resisted. Changing curricula involves changing power relations and re-shaping people's professional identities, but at the same time it must not ride rough-shod over teachers' perceptions of their professional integrity. (In the discussion after my talk one teacher put these problems in concrete form by describing the threat to other teachers posed by some of them being involved in curriculum projects promoted from outside the school.) These considerations indicate the necessity which Margaret Shepherd stressed of involving teachers actively in the planning processes involved, '... for it is the only way [they] will carry out a course with any real commitment.'

The comment was also made that integration lay in what the pupils did with their learning rather than in the plans of their teachers. Unless the principles of integration and the intended links are made explicit to students, the kind of learning hoped for will not take place. This raises the question as to whether integrated courses in themselves are important vehicles for this; or whether the single subject imaginatively taught by a teacher who ranges out from it to make links with everyday knowledge and with other disciplines will do just as good an integrative job. (Hence the relevance of the proposal to build into single-subject A levels a section putting them into a wider context.) The argument however becomes tautological if it leads one to define integrated courses only in terms of courses in which pupils can be seen to have perceived the links for themselves, and not in those which, as one example described it (see Appendix C), 'students associated me with "history" and seldom made cross-references.'

To summarize so far:

Two models of curriculum change seem to have arisen.

(1) Those confining integration to the social sciences	(2) Those concerned with integration more broadly conceived, but with a social science component

Each is associated with a cluster of characteristics.

(a) A view of curriculum change on a rational overall plan in which aims and principles shape the course, e.g. a concern with structure (Thomas Bennett).	(a) A more pragmatic interactive view, in which principles and aims arise out of the teaching-learning process, e.g. a concern with process (Loughton).
(b) A scientific view of the social disciplines derived from the natural sciences.	(b) An interactive, speculative view of the social disciplines.
(c) A focus on cognitive learning.	(c) A focus on affective and social learning, as well as cognitive learning.

* M.F.D. Young, in Young (ed.), op. cit., p.33

I would emphasize that these are models; the differences were never so clear-cut, as such differences never are in practice. But it suggests that the two models may be helpful in pointing to what any project might do, and in emphasizing the choices facing teachers trying to implement integrated courses.

4. What should a social science project do?

The conference seemed to see curriculum change as being generated in two ways. (a) According to a logical plan, possibly from outside an institution. This has the advantage of being generalizable and the disadvantage of asking teachers to work on material they have not generated themselves. (b) In a more pragmatic, spontaneous way, working with students within an institution. This has the advantage of commitment and response to local needs; and the disadvantage of being specific to the teachers involved. The central problem for a project would seem to be how to use the advantages of the second way and make its results more widely available to others. Here one might raise a second central question - that of assessment. Nothing 'generalizes' a course content more than setting a public examination in it. Courses designed for sixth-form pupils must build in an examination qualfication which offers entry to higher education, for if they do not they will remain peripheral to their main interests; but all speakers pointed to the difficulties of operating within the given examination structure, and called for flexible assessment procedures taking account of new aims and methods. Many were afraid of the premature closure of the issues by the setting up of an integrated social science A level at this stage; and some equivalent of CSE Mode III was seen by them as essential to further progress. Any sixth-form project is going to have to face this problem squarely. In the light of these general issues the conference urged first that any project launched should not embark on an ambitious programme generated by a central team of curriculum developers, and accompanied by masses of pre-selected course materials. Rather it should be tentative and encouraging and adopt a more 'cellular' approach (as group C described it) involving schools and teachers in the innovation wherever they showed interest. As group B's rapporteur put it, a project should 'search, research, evaluate and support.' That is, it should 'find the valuable on the ground, investigate its content and organisation, evaluate it, and (in the light of this) mobilize support for it.' The only question here is - what is there that is valuable, on the ground? Present evidence suggests there may be little, particularly if the search is limited to courses that keep within the social sciences, and are at an appropriate level. What should a project do if it finds nothing? There is obviously a further obligation to generate experiments where it seems opportune, and not to start with a too narrowly defined notion of the appropriate range of subjects.

Second, that it must look urgently into the matter of assessment, including the modest proposal for extending present A-level papers. This must involve working with examination boards as well as teachers. A suitable solution to this issue is the most crucial practical question faced by any new course at sixth-form level.

Third, that it should look at the central issue of the development and availability of suitable resources, and the best way of supporting teachers by providing access to resources without destroying their own initiatives. An illustration of the real problem involved here is in our social science course at the Institute of Education; we make available to our students in a 'workshop' as many resources as possible for them to use on teaching practice. They take polite note and they use some. During the year, however, they are expected to develop their own material, for teaching around chosen themes; they demonstrate these to other students with excitement because they have seen them as

significant. In some cases the materials already existed in our workshop but the students have overlooked this because they had not thought through their implications for themselves.

Fourth, that the problems of teacher education at all levels and through all means should be centrally considered, bearing in mind the widest interpretation of what is involved in changing people's professional identities.

Finally, it is important to study carefully the organizational conditions, social processes and kinds of teachers involved in successful curriculum innovation. Attempts should be made to encourage such conditions, or at any rate to make schools aware of the wider implications of what they are doing when they innovate in the curriculum.

Conclusion

Perhaps I could close with one or two general considerations which should put the topic of sixth-form integrated social science teaching into perspective.

First: the introduction of the kinds of methods and open approaches indicated here is relatively new at this level. Normally we preserve active inquiry for the primary school and our less able secondary pupils. We initiate our able pupils into a specialist closed body of knowledge whose mysteries are gradually revealed, and only when they have successfully graduated do we allow them again to pursue their own inquiries. By introducing new methods and courses at a senior level in the secondary school we demand that pupils adjust themselves to new definitions of acceptable classroom learning, and this is bound to produce problems as Peter Mitchell indicated. Any curriculum plans at sixth-form level need therefore to be looked at in relation to the lower secondary-school course. Similarly, those attempting to change the teacher education of graduates to provide new notions of the job of the specialist subject teacher might have something to learn from the education of infant and junior teachers.

Second: the teaching of the social sciences on any scale is new at school level. I have seen enough of the results of school sociology teaching to suggest that we do not yet know much about how to put across these elusive concepts, this potentially explosive content, nor enough of their effects on our pupils.

It might help those of us who are social scientists to appreciate this point if we think back to their effects on us as students. For example, I think group D was right to express concern about the difficulty of understanding social science concepts, and the dangers for young students of substituting them, half-understood, for common-sense terms. There is not much value in merely teaching students to express their ideas in more esoteric language.

Third: the question was raised several times in the conference of the relation between cognitive and affective learning. We cannot assume cognitive learning unless we can deal with what our students feel about what we are teaching; learning about society as it affects us is a study fraught with controversial issues (and in this of course lies its potential value). The importance of taking account of this is brought out forcibly in the recent Bruner anthropological material in Man: a Course of Study* and in Richard

* Bruner, op. cit.

Jones's critique of it,* based on an examination of the actual classroom interaction of teachers and children. On the evening of the first day of the conference we saw some of the films from the Bruner material, which Jones studied. I wonder how many of us looked at these without revulsion at the skinning of seals and the eating of raw eyes? How can one use such material and take full account of its emotional impact, particularly if we see as a major aim the erosion of ethnocentricism? Peter Mitchell talked of the value of anthropology and Professor Drake described how the Open University used examples from other cultures for just this purpose. But it is not enough merely to include exotic material. We have to know how to put it into context and handle reactions to it positively. I do not think we really know much about how to do this, though Jones' examples of teachers' attempts to face the problem with a much younger age group are very suggestive. The study of class structure or race relations in our own society provides obvious examples of the general problem of teaching any course which provides new perspectives on society.

I raise these general questions, only to suggest that there is a great deal within the field of social science teaching which requires investigation. The development of an integrated social science course for sixth forms is one among the many possibilities.

---

* Richard M. Jones, Fantasy and Feeling in Education (Harper & Row, 1968).

APPENDIX A

Examples from Thomas Bennett School used by Peter Mitchell

A. Steps in a mode of inquiry for the social studies (Thomas Bennett School)

1. Recognizing a problem from data
2. Formulating hypotheses
   (a) asking analytical questions
   (b) stating hypotheses
   (c) remaining aware of the tentative nature of hypotheses
3. Recognizing the logical implications of hypotheses
4. Gathering data
   (a) selecting relevant data
   (b) evaluating sources
      (i) determining the frame of reference of an author
      (ii) determining the accuracy of statements of fact
   (c) interpreting the data
5. Evaluating the hypothesis in the light of data
   (a) modifying the hypothesis if necessary
      (i) rejecting a logical implication unsupported by data
      (ii) restating the hypothesis
   (b) stating a generalization

B. An example of a course unit from Thomas Bennett School - the individual, the family and education

1. The effects on the development of the individual of being deprived of communicative interaction with other people: studies of 'feral children', children reared in isolation, and case-studies of young children separated from their parents (maternal deprivation).
2. How children learn - an introduction to various psychological explanations of learning:

   instinctive behaviour in insects and animals;

   most human behaviour by contrast is learned;

   classical and operant conditioning as explanations of learning;

   limitations of these behaviourist models as complete accounts of human learning.

3. The development of the individual as a member of a family:

role-taking - the learning of sex roles, with particular reference to examples from Eskimo families;

familial roles - comparison of Eskimo families and changes in familial roles in contemporary society;

conformity and role-taking - distinction between 'passive' versus 'active' views of socialization.

4. Introduction to the comparative study of family structure:

examination of concepts of 'family', extended family, joint family, nuclear family, domestic group.

also of systems of marriage - monogamy, polygamy, polyandry.

Studies of: (i) Eskimo: a variety of acceptable domestic groups;
(ii) matrilineal kinship systems - Nayar, Ashanti, Trobriands.

5. Education and knowledge in selected primitive cultures:

'informal' processes of education in technically very simple societies; societies lacking specialized educational institutions and roles, e.g. Hadza, Cheyenne;

age-grade systems and their educational functions in East African societies, especially the Kikuyu;

cultural experience and taken-for-granted definitions of intellectual and perceptual abilities:

cross-cultural studies of interpretation of perspective drawings;
cross-cultural studies of definitions and measurement of 'intelligance'.

concept of the cognitive aspects of socialization arising out of the foregoing.

6. Education, the social distribution of knowledge and social stratification:

(i) Study of Rwanda, including the breakdown of the 'master symbols of legitimation' transmitted via the traditional system of education;

(ii) Social stratification and education in Victorian England

introduces concepts of: social class, market situation, work situation, life-chances, life-style;

poverty: contemporary nineteenth-century investigators of poverty - Mayhew, Booth, Rowntree and their definitions of poverty;

the Poor Law and workhouses: concept of 'stigma';

the development of specialized educational institutions and roles during the nineteenth century;

comparative study of elementary and preparatory/public school education related to social stratification, with special reference to curricula.

7. Project work

An extended opportunity for less closely structured inquiry into a range of topics of the student's own choosing. Areas of inquiry include various aspects of the family and/or education and/or social stratification in contemporary industrial societies.

APPENDIX B

Joint study - 'Between the Wars'

Jenny and Ian MacWhinnie

Kingsway College of Further Education

1. Introduction

This study was taught by two teachers; one a literature specialist, the other a political scientist/historian. It was conceived to meet the needs of academically less able students, to provide a general study of the inter-war period, and to prepare the students in the skills required for O levels in English Literature and World Affairs since 1919, both of which they might sit two years later. The intention was not to set up an integrated study, but rather to adopt a twin disciplinary approach to the examination of the period. Unfortunately, there was no attempt to be comprehensive via a multi-disciplinary approach.

2. Description

The study can be divided into two main components - the one for history and the other for literature. The literature component included the War poets, W.H. Auden, C. Day Lewis, Louis MacNeice; the drama included the Theatre Workshop production of Oh! What a Lovely War, Ionesco's Rhinoceros, Max Frisch and Arnold Wesker; D.H. Lawrence's short stories, Graves' Goodbye to All That, and Orwell's Homage to Catalonia and various essays. The history component included the First World War, its political, social and economic consequences; likewise the great depression; the rise of Fascism and Communism, the nature of their appeal and of their supporters; appeasement. These history topics were dealt with chronologically and the literature was selected to complement these topics as much as possible.

The study occupied two 1½-hour periods - the first being taught by the literature specialist, the second by the historian. The literature teacher was timetabled with an entirely different class during one of the periods.

Once under way, the teachers tried to get away from the original conception and attempt more integration by emphasizing the interrelationships between the components and by examining topics such as the development of jazz and swing, or the significance of changes in fashion. Nevertheless, this aptly named joint study failed as an integrated study. An analysis of this failure suggests certain vital considerations about integration, and also poses some questions.

3. Limitations of the study

(a) The students tended to divide the study rigidly into its two components. This was encouraged by the timetabling arrangements which forced Jenny to teach the first period and me the second. My experience was that the students associated me with 'history' and they seldom made cross references to relevant poems or short stories. They were inhibited, I suspect, by their preconceptions of what history required. Curiously, Jenny did not find the same

reluctance. Nevertheless, in their project work they kept to a literature or history topic and were reluctant to combine the two components, although such a combination was made a requirement of the project. This situation stems considerably, I think, from the timetable arrangement which limited what could happen in the classroom. Timetables need to be flexible enough to permit staff to be involved at irregular times and for varying lengths of time.

This particular failing of the joint study raises, I think, a basic question. Is it correct to say that specialist subject teachers cause students, to a greater or lesser extent, to think in the narrow terms of that particular discipline? This, although proper in part, works against the idea of integration which I take to be the aim of giving students a more comprehensive understanding, and a less partial one. In other words, is an integrated study more than the sum of its specialist subject parts? I think that it needs some built-in component, like the crude project of our joint study, which will act as a centripetal force to overcome the centrifugal forces of the separate subjects.

(b) A second main failing of the joint study was the absence of a clearly defined aim. We did not decide before we began what it was in this period that we wanted to understand, and after that to decide what each subject could contribute. The history set the pace and the literature tried to complement it. However, at times, the two components began to diverge. The students could be finishing a play related to a topic which had been finished for some weeks in the history class. This, of course, reinforced the traditional subject distinctions held by the students.

There is a problem associated with diverging from a defined aim of a study. This divergence can easily disrupt the integration, but can be extremely valuable in another sense. A dilemma occurs when a class discovers an interest which it wants to follow up. However, that follow-up may bear little relation to what is being done in the other components of the integrated study. What degree of divergence is acceptable?

(c) The joint study was not a comprehensive study. I was very conscious of how partial was the understanding that I was giving of this period. For example, an understanding of Nazi Germany involves an awareness of the psychology of prejudice. This I could not adequately provide. I am attracted to integrated studies because of their comprehensiveness, but presumably they cannot include everything. This conference is about integrated studies in the social sciences. Does that mean that language and literature should be excluded? What are the criteria by which subjects are excluded or included?

4. The study as amended

In planning the course for the next year, we decided that the original idea of a preparatory course for two specific O levels imposed unacceptable limitations on what students could do in class. We also decided that literature drawn from only one period was not a sufficiently flexible or encouraging introduction for pre-O-level students. We therefore selected two contemporary themes - current unemployment in Britain and the effects of the Vietnam War on the USA. These were studied with reference to unemployment and the effects of war in Britain in the period 1914-39. Literature and creative writing were used extensively as approaches to these topics. Subject distinctions were obscured, and the timetable

allowed us more flexibility about when either or both of us should be in the classroom. A joint class project to produce a 'radio programme' on tape further integrated the different elements of the students' work.

APPENDIX C (i)

The Advanced Level Integrated Course

Joan Whitehead

Loughton College of Further Education

Department of General Studies

What we mean by integration

1. We felt that teaching methods which emphasized only the purity of subjects, and teaching methods which denied the differentiation of knowledge into subjects were equally limited in offering students a means to understanding the world. Therefore we believed it important for students to retain the consciousness of a discipline (to be aware of its central concerns and appropriate methods of inquiry) and at the same time to have experienced the joint contribution that different disciplines can make to the understanding of a specific topic, or the solving of a particular problem.

2. Ideally we felt that students at this stage should be allowed the opportunity to study a wider range of disciplines than two. However, we felt it to be educationally more valid to 'integrate' subjects from different rather than similar disciplines. It would seem that students with a grounding in the methodology of one of the social sciences would be able, later on, to comprehend more easily other social sciences, e.g. anthropology, social psychology. Integration solely based within a discipline and to the exclusion of other disciplines therefore seemed limiting.

3. We saw 'integration' as more than that between areas of knowledge. We aimed at an integration through teaching method of the theoretical and the practical, the academic and the recreational, the academic and the creative.

Advantages of this approach

1. Educational planning
   It meant that teachers had to plan the course in a more detailed way and it meant they became more aware of students' progress and problems through frequent discussion.

2. Social
   As the group of students were together for the bulk of the week they gained a strong group identity which appeared a motivational factor. They also developed a spirit of concern for one another which is important given the comparative insecurity of further education colleges.

3. The approach reinforced learning when students saw the relevance of a subject outside its own strictures.

The course

The course was designed for a group of students of a wide ability range, interested in teaching as a career, and aiming at two or more A levels for entrance to college of education or university. All students spent 21 hours a week on Integrated Studies i.e., studies leading to A-level English and sociology (AEB Syllabus) and O-level general studies, and opted for A-level history, art, puppetry, domestic science, or sport for another 7 hours, and the College's Elective and Liberal Studies programme. Referring to the latter, students were encouraged during the two years to select a science course.

Students were prepared for AEB Mode III O-level sociology at the end of the first year and Mode I general studies at the end of the second year. The emphasis in both of these was on creativity, flexibility, study in depth, and course work, thus encouraging our teaching method. An intrinsic part of the course was a morning's placement in a pre-school playgroup during the first year, and in a junior or secondary school in the second year. In no sense did we believe the students should teach at this stage, but merely aimed at providing them with some understanding of children through small, informal group work without the pressure of a 'teaching practice'. We felt it would give some practical insight into the theoretical ideas put forward during the course. For similar reasons drama was included in the course.

We had to plan our course round the existing examination syllabuses, but where possible each subject teacher taught that section of his course which related most closely to the topic being taught by the other teachers at the same time. The drama class took its themes from the English, sociology and history classes. The English and sociology teachers were timetabled to teach the class together for one session. In this joint session, we studied a topic of mutual importance and interest to both subjects.

For example, in the first term the students were studying Hard Times as an English set text, aspects of the family and education from the sociology syllabus, and the Industrial Revolution in history. In our joint session we chose as our integrating themes childhood and education.

Department of General Studies

Topic approach

Work sheet
Term 1

CHILDHOOD (team-taught)

1. Early development - Socialization
   - Development of values

References

'Animula' T.S. Eliot
Cider with Rosie Laurie Lee (Extract)
Child Care and Growth of Love J. Bowlby and M. Fry
Isolated Children K. Davies (Extract)

• Importance of play

Play with a Purpose for Under-sevens E.M. Matterson
Value of Play J. McClelland
There is a Happy Land Keith Waterhouse (Extract)
Spring Song by Joyce Cary
Learn as you Play (Film - College production)

Practical session using paint and junk materials to show pot ntial of these for sensory development of child

3. Effect of environment on children (social differences)

Portrait of the Artist as a Young Dog Dylan Thomas (Extract)
Kibbutz extract
Poem Stephen Spender
Four years old in an Urban Community J. Newson and E. Newson
Great Expectations (Film)
7 Up (and 7 + 7)

Drama - Improvisation on the theme of a children's playground

4. Language and emotional development of children

'Blue Umbrellas' D.J. Enright
'The Cool Webb' Robert Graves
'Margaret' A.N. Hopkins
Bernstein's work on social linguistics
Dibs: In Search of Self Virginia Axline (Extract)
Warrandale (Film)

Visit to local infant school (vertical grouped)
Tape recordings of children's conversations and a story-time in playgroups

5. Students divided into four groups each producing a small project on childhood of their own choosing and undirected by the staff

Group A Made a film with an imaginative sound track of activities at local nursery school

Group B Questionnaire to two families in different social class neighbourhoods about their child-rearing practices

Group C and D Anthologies of poems, creative writing, and collections of children's paintings

The whole group produced a pantomime at the end of the first term for the local infants' school.

Aim - creative as it was written and improvised by the students themselves.

It served a useful purpose in analysis of the sort of language children would understand, the character and themes they would enjoy. It stimulated their interaction, and performance developed the self-confidence of the students.

EDUCATION

References

'Schoolboy' by Brian Patten
The Roaring Boys E. Blishen (Extract)
Extract about T.S. Mills

Visits

Kes (Film)

Drama work

We improvised different classes in different types of school and discussed the different roles of the teacher.

Department of General Studies

SOCIOLOGY

1. Pre-school provisions available locally, nationally and in other societies

(a) Visit to a pre-school playgroup in local area.
(b) '0-5' Study of care of children S. Yudkin
(c) Working Mothers and their Children S. Yudkin and A. Holmes (Extract)
(d) Extracts from Times Educational Supplement on children living in multi-storey blocks of flats and in overcrowded conditions.
(e) Headstart programme in USA.
(f) Publications by Pre-school Playgroups Association.

2. General changes in primary and secondary education

(a) Tape recording and slides of television programme 'Learning to Live' demonstrating some of main changes.
(b) Visit to Camden Arts Centre for exhibition organized by Camden CASE group to contrast learning in 1870 and now, e.g. miniature classroom of 1870 shown.
(c) The Philosophy of Primary Education. R.F. Dearden (Extract)

3. Effect of home and school environment at primary level

(a) Visit to primary school in educational priority area with high percentage immigrant children for comparison with previous vertically grouped local infants school.
(b) Study of sections of Plowden Report.
(c) Detailed study The Home and the School J.W.B. Douglas
(d) Detailed study of Grouping in the Infants School L. Ridgway and I. Lawton
(e) Streaming - an educational system in miniature B. Jackson. (Extract)
(f) Brief look at educational provision in other countries, e.g. Russia, Israel.

4. Home and school environment at secondary level

(a) Visit to a comprehensive school in a new town.
(b) Social Class and the Comprehensive School J. Ford
(c) The Comprehensive School R. Pedley
(d) Which Comprehensive Principle? D. Marsden (Extract)
(e) Education and the Working Class B. Jackson and D. Marsden
(f) Social Relations in a Secondary Modern School D.H. Hargreaves
(g) The Living Tradition F. Stevens
(h) Reference to the Newsom Report.

This was the basic reading but many students read additional articles and books.

5. The private sector

(a) Visit to a local public school.
(b) Hothouse Society R. Lambert
(c) Public Schools and Private Practice J. Wilson
(d) Loyalty in a Closed Society R. Lambert (Extract)

6. The school as a social system

(a) The School as an Organisation P.W. Musgrave
(b) Education R.A. King (Chapter 5)
(c) The School in Contemporary Society D.A. Goslin

7. Further and higher education. Is there an 18+?

(a) Robbins Report.
(b) The New Polytechnics E.E. Robinson
(c) Recent press cuttings.

All students as part of the Mode III have to submit a project and many chose one from this section of the syllabus.

Examples of titles:

Bancrofts School: a social survey of an Independent School.

Educational facilities in Epping for children under eleven.

Pre-school education with particular reference to the Chigwell Urban District.

Comprehensive reorganization in Chigwell.

The school as an organization: before and after the introduction of 'interdisciplinary inquiry'.

These projects will be available after the June examination.

ENGLISH

Detailed work

Set book - Hard Times Charles Dickens

Film Great Expectations

The Industrial Revolution was covered in history at the same time. Drama work on the Industrial Revolution.

Other themes covered (a) marriage
(b) Christianity
(c) social satire
(d) caricatures and cartoons.

With relevant poems, pictures, and literary extracts.

APPENDIX C (ii)

An Integrated O-level Course for Mature Students

M. Shepherd

Loughton College of Further Education Department of General Studies

The students on this course were of mixed ability and their ages ranged from seventeen to forty-six.

All students took five O-level subjects at the end of one year, English language, English literature, sociology, history and general studies. Because three of these subjects were Mode III examinations and one Mode II, we could plan more flexibly than in the advanced level

integrated course. Also the method of assessment, taking into account course work, oral work, original inquiry and group projects more fully endorsed our teaching method. In the only Mode I subject [illegible] literature, we chose an alternative syllabus which gave us freedom to choose some of the books ourselves.

We planned the course loosely around the following topics: childhood, education, family and the community, power and authority, women and marriage, and the welfare state.

We had one joint session a week, in which we tried to bring our studies together. For example, whilst studying the Indian Mutiny in history, the students had been reading their set English text Nightrunners of Bengal*. There had been some informal discussion about the question of the book's bias. In the joint session we organized a debate on this question, which involved questions of historical validity and perceptive interpretation of the novel.

In another joint session when our theme was the Welfare State we spent our session considering poverty. Two students presented a short scene from The Caretaker by Harold Pinter.† Another sang a relevant folk song, and some presented the group with their findings about Victorian attitudes to poverty. Another gave a critical account of Coates'and Silburn's study of poverty in Nottingham.‡

We did not expect that whilst reading Julius Caesar, we could only discuss it in relation to 'power and authority' but we did choose a part of it to work on for the joint session. The group community study organized by the sociology teacher took several weeks. We let the students use the joint session time to go out and make their inquiries, collect their data and write up their reports. The teachers used this time for individual or small group tutorials, and sometimes for planning amongst themselves, and discussing some of the students' difficulties.

I think our scheme was too ambitious for a one-year course, but although the students felt over-worked they enjoyed it.

---

* Nightrunners of Bengal by John Masters (Penguin, 1955).

† The Caretaker by Harold Pinter (Methuen, 1967).

‡ Poverty: the forgotten Englishmen by K. Coates and R. Silburn (Penguin Books, 1970).

APPENDIX D

Participants in the Conference

Discussion Groups

A. R. Irvine Smith (Chairman), General Studies Project, University of York
D. Killingray (Raporteur), Head of General Studies, Sevenoaks School, Kent
R.S. Burgess, St John's College of Further Education
C. Giles, Head of Economics Department, Burnage High School for Boys, Manchester 19
Dr P. Gordon, HMI (Assessor, Social Sciences Committee)
G. Kirkwood, Furzedown College of Education
Mrs J. Whitehead, Loughton College of Further Education
R.D. Wild, Teesside College of Education

B. F.W.C. Benemy (Chairman), William Ellis School, London NW5 (Social Sciences Committee)
B. Dufour, (Raporteur), Tutor in Social Science Education, Leicester University
Mrs C. Cannon, University of London Institute of Education
Miss K. Forrester, Social Science Department, Kidbrooke School, London SE3
I. McWhinnie, Kingsway College of Further Education
P.J. Mitchell, Head of Humanities Faculty, The Thomas Bennett School, Crawley
A. Morton, Edge Hill College of Education
W.A. Reid, Sixth Form Curriculum and Examinations Project, School of Education, Birmingham University

C. Miss M.E. Butcher (Chairman), Head of History Department, Maidstone Grammar School for Girls
D. Jenkins (Raporteur), Keele Integrated Studies Project, Institute of Education, University of Keele
L. Clark HMI, Scottish Education Department
Miss M.M. Craig, Bishop Fox's Girls' School, Taunton
Mrs B. Curtis, Levenshulme High School for Girls, Manchester 19
D. George, Head of History Department, Llandyssul Grammar School, Cardiganshire
Miss M. Shepherd, Loughton College of Further Education
E.R. Spelman, The County High School, Arnold, Nottinghamshire (Social Sciences Committee)

D. H.G. Davies (Chairman), ILEA Divisional Office 1 (Social Sciences Committee)
Dr M. Shipman (Raporteur), Lecturer in Sociology, Department of Education, University of Keele
A. Bell, Keswick Hall College of Education, Norwich
P.G. Cox, Head of Economics Department, Tonbridge School, Kent
Mrs A. Hedge, General Studies Project, University of York
D.W. Howells, Afon Taf, Merthyr Tydfil
Mrs J. Jones, London University Institute of Education

Mrs P. Mathews, Sociology Department, Sydenham School, London SE26
P.T. Naylor, Sixth Form Curriculum Officer, Schools Council
T.F. Wiseman, Thurstable School, Tiptree, Colchester

E. Professor W.A.L. Blyth (Chairman), School of Education, University of Liverpool
P.M. Jackson (Raporteur), The Highfield School, Letchworth, Herts
P.C. Boate, Head of Social Sciences Department, Pool Hayes Comprehensive School, Willenhall, Walsall, Staffs
J. Brown, Field Officer, Schools Council
P. Fordham, Project Officer, Schools Council
Mrs M. Foster, Head of Commerce Department, Westwood Secondary School for Girls, SE19
C. Griffiths, Margaret McMillan College of Education
M. Johnson, Kingsway College of Further Education
L. Stenhouse, Director, CARE (Centre for Applied Research in Education)
Mrs M.A. Walton, Associated Examining Board
Mrs E. Wormald, Worcester College of Education

Other participants

Professor P. Abrams, Department of Sociology, University of Durham
Professor M. Drake, The Open University
F.D. Flower MBE, Principal, Kingsway College of Further Education
Miss J. Rudduck, Assistant Director, CARE (Centre for Applied Research in Education)